

B
JAN 7 1910

* DA

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

200000
CHURCH AND
PENNSYLVANIA

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy.

THE 469490

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

VOL. XL—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1910.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1910

* DA

CONTENTS

I. IF THE OLD FAITH IS DEAD, CHRISTIANITY IS DEAD.....	1
BY REV. G. U. WENNER, D.D.	
II. THOUGHTS ON CONFESSORIAL QUESTIONS.....	12
BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.	
III. THE PROPHET AMOS.....	34
BY REV. HENRY W. A. HANSON.	
IV. METAPHYSICAL THERAPEUTICS AND THE CHURCH	65
BY REV. J. M. CROMER, D.D.	
V. THE BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT.....	78
BY REV. WM. WEBER, PH.D.	
VI. THE QUIN-CENTENARY JUBILEE OF LEIPSIC UNIVERSITY.....	96
BY REV. H. E. BERKEY.	
VII. THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL REFORM.....	106
BY REV. JUNIUS B. REMENSYDER, D.D., LL.D.	
VIII. THE CHURCH AND THE COLLEGE.....	115
BY PROFESSOR JOHN A. W. HAAS, D.D.	
IX. MELANCHTHON'S LETTER ON LUTHER'S MARRIAGE.....	124
BY PROFESSOR J. ALFRED FAULKNER.	
X. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.....	127
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.	
XI. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.....	145

The Sociology of the Bible—Social Duties from the Christian Point of View—The Starry Universe the Christian's Future Empire—That Man Donaleitis—Anniversary Addresses 1869-1909—Our Homes and Our Children—Unterscheidungslehren der hauptsächlichen sich Lutherisch nennenden Synoden, so wie der namhaftesten Sektenkirchen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika—An Epoch in the Scriptural Life—The Socialized Church—Prophecy and the Prophets in Their Historical Relations—The Earliest Cosmologies—The Bible for Home and School: Genesis—The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians—The Temple—A Certain Rich Man—The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine—Der Zionsbote—The Christian Doctrine of God.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1910.

ARTICLE I.

IF THE OLD FAITH IS DEAD, CHRISTIANITY IS DEAD.*

BY REV. G. U. WENNER, D.D.

The disciples of the new theology loudly proclaim that the Old Faith is dead, in this modern world absolutely dead. But not Christianity. Christianity, they say, is about to set out on a new career of victory, by virtue of the new value assigned to Christ. We must resolutely remove Christ from the side of God where the Old Faith has placed him, and we must put him on the side of man. Then Christianity will no longer be an isolated manifestation, but will be regarded as the fruit, and that too, the fairest fruit of the great religio-historic development of humanity. We shall have broken with that unfortunate superstition which so long has obscured Christianity, that God, ignoring the rest of the nations, made a special revelation of himself to a people located in a small corner of the world. We shall have broken too, with that bad habit which has so often sullied the reputation of Christianity, the habit of looking down with pharisaic pride upon the non-Christian religions of the world. If Christianity is to be a religion for everybody it must be shown to be the product of the general development.

Exception may be taken to some of these statements. We do

*An abstract of the third chapter of Dr. Theodore Kaftan's *Moderne Theologie des alten Glaubens*.

not look down with pharisaic pride on other religions. Our most ancient theology coined the phrase *logos spermatikos*. The theology of the Middle Ages placed great stress on the *revelatio generalis*. Nor have we forgotten the sermon which a distinguished adherent of the Old Faith once preached on the Areopagus to the people of Athens.

The Old Faith does indeed maintain that Christianity is a special revelation of God in Jesus Christ, but it does not assert that it is something separate from universal human history. Christianity is not an isolated religion. It is a fulfilment of that for which men everywhere have sought, among the Gentiles as well as in Israel. But while that is conceded, it is not the *product* of universal religion. In this sense the Old Faith isolates Christianity, it regards it as founded on him who is the one and only one, on Jesus Christ. On this point there can be no misunderstanding. That is our position. Only when the moderns bring this up as a charge against the Old Faith, and act as though they had made a wonderful discovery, something that had never been heard of before, they are either ignorant, or else they have forgotten. When Rationalism first roused the Church from the slumbers of orthodoxy it was Lessing who formulated practically the same charge in his famous and widely used apothegm: "The idea is not fond of expending its force in a single individual."¹

But we can go further back than Lessing. The substance of what he expressed in his phrase was the main charge of the Neoplatonists at the time when Christianity began to be victorious. Indeed in the days of the Emperor Hadrian, when the despised Nazarenism was first beginning to attract the attention of the "scholarly class," one of the smartest of that set, Celsus, made substantially the same charge against Christianity. Its alleged history he regards as a mosaic of fables more or less borrowed from other religions, just as our modern theology people are

¹ This was the fundamental thought of the old liberal school in theology, "not history, but idea." The difference was expressed by discriminating between Positives and Liberals. But the Liberals frequently objected to this discrimination on the ground that they also believed in religion and hence were "positive" in the highest degree. But this is confusing conceptions. Positive theology stands for historical facts. Liberal theology for the purely ideal.

claiming in our day. When he attacks it along philosophical lines his chief assault is against the ridiculous position of the Christians, that they had a special revelation, just as the Jews before them had claimed.

The thing, therefore, that distinguishes the Old Faith from the New, is essentially as old as the hills. It is the old battle between faith in Christ and the denial of Christ. The only new thing, relatively new at least, is the supreme confidence which our modern friends seem to have that by denying Christ they will infuse new life into Christianity. Doubtless they mean well, but they are deceiving themselves. When the Old Faith dies, Christianity will be dead. Christian faith consists of the specific revelation in Jesus Christ, that is of the revelation of God in the person of Christ. In his death on the cross, and his resurrection from the dead.

We must, however, guard against misunderstandings in two directions. We do not say that everyone who repudiates the Old Faith is personally not a Christian. Personal Christianity is revealed not only in a man's faith, but in the entire output of his life. Without personal conversion there is no such thing as personal Christianity. Fundamentally, personal Christianity is the soul's vital relation to the eternal God through the mediation of Christ. It is of course important for a man to have a true faith, a pure doctrine. But it is nevertheless possible under circumstances for a soul to stand in a vital relation to God, even though its intellectual operations are all wrong. Just as a man's head may have correct conceptions of God while he himself lacks pure Christianity.

Neither does the author claim that all faith in God, or all religion, will disappear along with Christianity. Religion existed in the world, apart from Israel, before Christ came. Plato's philosophy contains a great deal of religion. Within the bounds of Christendom there is considerable religion that does not proceed from the gospel. For example, the mysticism of the Middle Ages, and Schleiermacher's Sermons on Religion. (Dr. Eliot's views had not yet been published.)

Religion will not die, but *that* Christian faith in God, that is, faith in the living God, who is the Father of us all, who graciously forgives sins and by divine forgiveness grants unto us

OL
4 O
SS
1
A
10
MI

4 *If the Old Faith is Dead, Christianity is Dead.* [Jan.

everlasting life, here in this world and in the world to come forever, *this* religion will lose its hold as soon as the revelation in regard to Christ's person, his death on the cross, and his resurrection is found to be an illusion that will not stand the test of our clearer perceptions, our fuller knowledge. Faith is not a figuring with possibilities, not a supposing of probabilities, it is assurance. And what is there in all the world, out of Christ, that can tell us of the grace of God, of a life that is stronger than death, of a God who is our Father? Those of us who are sure of Christ know something of the reality of redemption, of salvation founded upon the cross of Christ. But if the cross is eliminated how shall we be assured of the grace of God, not merely in the days of sunshine but then also when the soul cries out of the depths. Some people refer us directly to God. But how do you know that God is good if you do not know him in Christ?

Christians are assured of the reality of a life that transcends the power of death. But if the resurrection of Christ from the dead turns out to be an illusion, whence shall we derive the confidence of eternal life? Our individual life *seems* to be associated with the body. So far as we can see, the soul-life is inseparably connected with the body. When the body goes to pieces, the soul-life goes out. This experience is constantly repeating itself, and hence the idea keeps forcing itself upon us that individual human existence is conditioned by the individual body. It begins with the body and with the body it disappears. We shall need a strong proof to the contrary in order to obtain any other conviction. All sorts of considerations may be cited, but outside of the resurrection of Christ, they are empty. As for a living God, who takes an interest in these various living personalities, out of Christ how do you know that there is a living God, the Father of all, the Father of every one of us?

Without that specific revelation from which Christendom has been drawing for two millenniums, we shall have to go back to that which from ancient times has been the way the nations took to find their God, that *sum total of things* that surrounds us, which we call the world. *What does the world tell us about God?*

The world indicates that the absolute, as the philosophers say,

or God, as we would say, is a mighty creative force from which not only that life originates which we call the natural or material life, although we do not really know what it is, but also that life which we call spirit. This spirit life indicates that God is a Spirit. In fact everything indicates this. The things that we call nature and spirit are wonderfully connected. Everything that we call world bears the impress of the spirit. The marks of design are everywhere. In our day Natural Science shows in increasing measure that in a scientific explanation of the world, mechanical causality does not suffice. The marks of design show that there is a supreme intelligence in the creative force. The world is the proof of this. A supreme intelligence, but nothing more. It is a mistake to conclude from this that there is a personality, intelligence does not necessarily imply personality. We are constantly finding such a thing as a sub-personal intelligence, for example in many animals and even in plants, why should there not also be such a thing as a super-personal intelligence?

But when we want to know what the world has to say about God, we are not confined to our experience of nature. That which we call God manifests itself also in the history of humanity. Likewise in the history of the individual.

But whether in the history of the world or in individual life, the deepest experience is that which we call the moral order. In spite of many contradictory signs there is evidence in the world not only of supreme intelligence but also of a pronounced *ethos*. But here, too, it would be going too far to find in this fact the guarantee of a personal God. We incline to do this because we associate morality with personality. But such a powerful preacher of the moral order of the world as Fichte knew nothing of a personal God. These elements, design and moral order do not exclude the idea of personality but they do not prove the existence of a God, much less the God of Christianity.

On the contrary, common experience indicates that the great force that permeates the world takes no account of individuals. If you listen to what even Christians think and say outside of church and prayer meetings, you will find a multitude of doubts on this question. Think of the useless sufferings of innocent children, of accidents in which the innocent suffer as frequently

as the guilty, of premature deaths, or of such a holocaust as the Slocum disaster. These things give the impression that life is a chain of accidents, with the direction of which ethical intelligence has nothing to do, or if it has, that men are of as much concern to it as are the atoms of dust that float in a sunbeam.

To sum up, all that we can learn from the world, from the fullness of the manifestations of nature, from all the lessons of history, national or personal, does not go beyond tremendous force, supreme intelligence and a pronounced ethical principle. We do not get beyond the bounds of an ideal pantheism, a doctrine which is by no means atheistic, and which does not preclude the idea of life and development beyond the grave. This is what the world teaches, and in the realm of common experience there is nothing that can take us beyond this teaching of the world.

Will speculation do it? In a large sense speculation is a seeking after God. Men have always speculated. But thinking a thing does not make it so. Unless you have something to speculate with, your business is not sound. In point of fact, the great masters of speculative thought in all ages have been substantially pantheists.

Or will religion do it? Religion is not altogether an illusion. If speculation is a seeking after God, religion is coming into touch with God. The great demonstrations of natural religion in the West and in the East have all been substantially pantheistic. The full flower of natural religion is mysticism, and mysticism in its final development is pantheism. In the attainment of the knowledge of God neither speculation nor religion can bring us God, or give us anything more than what we get from *Gesamtwirklichkeit*, the totality of existing realities.

And what neither speculation nor religion can do by themselves, cannot be accomplished by that combination of the two which has frequently been attempted since the days of Schleiermacher, who showed that there was an independent province of religion in the soul-life of man. The effort was made to prove the psychical necessity of religion, and from that he concluded that there must be a God. But what kind of a God is he who must be reached by a process like this?

It is useless to attempt to escape. Turn whichever way you

will, in universal experience there is nothing that will lead you beyond what the world can tell you about God.

If the special revelation in Christ is an illusion, then Christianity falls to pieces. But here is where the Moderns interrupt. They say we do not reject Christ. On the contrary we regard him as a religious force of the greatest magnitude. But we reply, Christianity is dead not only when Jesus Christ is gone, but also when there is no other Christ than the one whom you can offer.

Who then is the Jesus of the Moderns?

It is a strange feeling that creeps over us when we hear the Moderns speak of Jesus Christ. The thought forces itself upon us, do they comprehend in any degree what he really is and what he is for us? And when this thought comes to me, it does not frighten me, it awakens in me a glad hope.

Such sacred questions are never to be treated as party questions. We must study them as men whose own souls are seeking for nothing else than truth, than reality. In such a strife, the quarrels and recriminations of parties must lie far beneath us. But the goal must be truth, reality. We must not be put off with beautiful thoughts, with expressions of enthusiastic affection, with confessions of fanatical devotion.

There is reason to hope that the person of Jesus Christ will eventually prove to be the way on which many of the Moderns, delivered from the trammels of their secular philosophy will find their way back to the only begotten of the Father, their Redeemer, their living Lord.

But here we must have a clear and definite view of what kind of a Jesus it is that the Moderns proclaim. We might attempt to give a composite view of what they say about Him. But it would seem to be safer to select a presentation which is widely recognized and accepted among them. Such a book we have in Bousset's "Jesus," written for the purpose of telling evangelical Christians who Jesus was in reality, according to the results of scientific investigation, written too not merely in the interests of scientific research, but with the purpose of serving religion and the religious needs of men. This little book of Bousset's is looked upon by the Moderns as the ripe fruit and consummation of their theology.

The last of the three chapters of his book is entitled "The Secret of His Personality." It is this that concerns us here.

According to Bousset it is hard to tell what Jesus took himself to be because his life in the gospel was portrayed by faith and not in the spirit of historical accuracy. But the most certain thing that we know in this direction is that he looked upon himself as the Messiah, and it is most probable that he attained this conviction in the hour of his baptism. He claimed to be more than one of a series, even a series of prophets. He was conscious of uttering the final, the decisive word, was convinced that he was bringing to completion, and that no one would come after him. This superprophetic consciousness, says Bousset, cannot be deleted from the account of his personality without destroying it altogether. It is true, the title Son of God in Jesus' own time can only be regarded as equivalent to Messiah. In the mouth of his disciples it first attained a deeper significance. But Bousset confesses that the word Son in Mt. 11, 27, does not have the meaning of a title.

The only Messianic title which according to Bousset, Jesus appropriated to himself and employed is that of Son of Man, in which he describes himself as a supernatural being, eternal, of divine glory, who will judge the world. But this is not to be understood as a clear knowledge drawn from his personal consciousness. In the Synoptics Jesus never thought of claiming a premundane existence, nor a position of judge of the world. What then is the significance of his application to himself of the messianic title, Son of Man? In view of the impending fate of his final overthrow he clung to the Danielic promise of the Son of Man and applied it to himself. Of this expectation, in which the thought of Jesus finally landed, that in the near future he would return in the clouds of heaven, surrounded by his angels, Bousset says that strange as it appears to us, it was in reality a great feat for Jesus. It was the form in which he brought the certainty of his approaching death into harmony with the consciousness of his messiahship. (Of a suffering Messiah the Old Testament knows nothing). Here, too, the deepest foundation is his trust in his Father.

Thereupon Bousset reverts to the consciousness of Jesus, and in exalted language describes it in its radiant manifestation.

Closing the description with this sentence: "This is either frivolous presumption or sublime strength and assurance. History has decided in favor of the latter." Then Bousset continues:

"And in all of this he never transcends the limits of the purely human. Proofs: Mark 10, 18; Luke 11, 28; Mark 3, 33 f. Also his submitting to the baptism of John. Never did he demand faith in himself as he demanded faith in God. True, in appropriating to himself the idea of the Son of Man, he almost crossed the line, but he did not make himself equal with God."

Bousset then characterizes as unthinkable the idea that Jesus should have had such a thought, and shows that it was the product of the development of the Christian idea in the Church by pointing out the changes that Mt. 10, 32, said to be genuine, is said to have experienced in Mark 8, 38, and even in Mt. 16, 27.

What Jesus thought with respect to his death we do not know, for the last supper tradition is according to Bousset, exceedingly questionable, and upon such a solitary expression as Mark 10, 45, no dependence can be placed. Still it is possible that Jesus said it. But if he did, he did not mean to teach that his death had any significance for our salvation. As for his resurrection, whatever is to be said in regard to this, according to Bousset, does not belong to the portrait of Jesus, but to the history of the early Church. The germ of the disciples' faith in regard to the Easter events lay in the powerful impression which Jesus made upon them.

So Bousset. And he is a fair exponent of the modern theology. Kaftan does not criticise it as a whole. The only question that interests us in this connection is whether the Christian faith can be maintained with such a theology. What are the characteristics of Jesus Christ according to this picture? With gratifying candor the self-consciousness of Jesus is delineated. But after all the fine words that you read there, indicative of respect, admiration, and reverence, he was nothing but a man. This Jesus, the Man of Nazareth, is the one to whom we owe it that we are Christian believers in the sense of Christianity.

But is this *possible*? What guarantee can *such* a Jesus give us that this faith is truth, is reality?

Placing ourselves upon the basis of modern theology, accepting the delineation of Jesus which they believe to have discov-

ered with scientific accuracy, confident with them that Jesus really believed what he taught about God and about eternal life and that he gave his life as a pledge of the truth of it all, does that prove that all this is so? Even though this hero of the history of religion sealed his conviction with his life, how does that prove that it is the truth. If Jesus as the Moderns say, never transcended the limits of humanity, I as a man, seriously searching for the truth, am compelled to ask him, Where did you get these ideas? And when I remember that his knowledge of God was derived from the Old Testament Church in which he grew up, it is a very different world in which we live now. Would he, if he had been brought up in our times, talk and teach as he did then? He undoubtedly was a religious genius, taught as no one before him taught and as no one since his time, up to the present time, has taught. But that does not prove that his ideas about God and eternal life correspond to the reality. We are no better off with the Jesus of the modern theology than we would be if he were eliminated altogether. He does not lift us above the plane of ideas which we had without him. And no serious and thoughtful person would claim that their Jesus is the Jesus of the Bible, the Jesus of the Church, the Jesus of Christianity from the beginning and the One in whom and through whom alone it has its existence.

The highest point that logical thinkers can attain, if modern theology succeeds, is a sort of eclectic religion such as Eucken describes a bit of Platonism, a bit of neo-platoism, some events from the history of civilization and a little personal religious experience such as may be found in Christian congregations. This, says Eucken, is Christianity reduced to its essential truth. *But this is not Christianity.* It has some facts, but as a whole it is the product of an aviating tone of mind highly prized by men whose minds are attuned that way, but offering nothing for men who are in search of reality.

We are living in a critical period. Not critical because Christianity is opposed. Excepting in the Middle Ages, Christianity has always been opposed. But this is the critical thing, that Christianity, historical Christianity, the Christ of the old gospel is opposed by men who themselves claim to be Christians, who feel sure that they are serving the cause of Christianity. It

is the story of Christ in the wilderness. Christianity is not to be put to death. It is to be aided to a stronger life. Give up, says the Tempter to the Church, that dream of the early Church of Christ from above. Give up those Pauline ideas of the cross and the resurrection. Turn away from Paul, it is high time to do this, and go back to Christ. See him in his simple human greatness in which he has in our day been revealed. Get rid of your isolation and plunge, as the real Jesus would have you do, into the great stream of religio-historic development. Then you will reach the full truth, then you will unfold the fulness of your strength.

And what wonderful perspectives are revealed. Already the dawn of a world-religion is appearing. When satiated with that which Solomon's temple and the synagogue of Nazareth can offer, we advance underneath the blue sky and absorb all the great religious ideas of humanity, the free sons of Israel will join us, and Islam unreached by Christian missions, will never be able to withstand a great and free Christianity that has got rid of the folly of an incarnate Son of God. And China and India. Was not Brahma Somadji a prophecy?

What a perspective! A vast Church of humanity in which, from the infinitude of separate notes, one great harmony proceeds, which like a hymn to the glory of the eternal Godhead fills with rapture the souls of all the nations. And the keynote of it all is Christianity, Christianity reduced to its essential and eternal truth. This is the new theology.

Perhaps the Old Faith is dead, but if the Old Faith is dead, Christianity is dead.

New York City.

ARTICLE II.

THOUGHTS ON CONFESSIONAL QUESTIONS.

(With special reference to Criticisms of the General Synod.)

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

Since the meeting of the General Synod in Richmond our critics of the German Synods have again been pretty busy. We do not doubt the sincerity of many of them. Much of our church life as it comes to an expression in our English periodicals, and as it is observed by our critics at places where our congregations and theirs are neighbors, seems to them very strange and out of harmony with what they are accustomed to consider the standard of true Lutheranism. But in their criticisms of the General Synod a number of things are left out of consideration: (1) That church work among the English necessarily must be of a different character from that among the Germans. The American is more subjective than the German. As a republican he is from childhood accustomed to more freedom and range for the individual than is the German, who was born in a monarchy and brought up in a State Church. This accounts for much of the difference in the methods of church work. (2) When some of our opponents direct their criticisms exclusively against the General Synod they fail to observe that practically the same would apply to the English constituency of the General Council and to the United Synod of the South. (3) They leave out of consideration that much of what they find fault with is exceptional and should not be regarded as characteristic of the whole body. As an example, it may have occurred that an individual pastor fellowshiped in worship with a Jew or a Unitarian. But such is a rare occurrence and always would meet with the disapproval of nearly all members of the General Synod. (4) It has always been an almost universally established principle in the Lutheran Church that church fellowship with even the more orthodox denominations should be avoided whenever such fellowship would be a practical demonstration

in favor of indifferentism as to the distinguishing doctrines of the two fellowshipping churches. But, in criticising the General Synod and other Anglicized synods on this point our opponents fail to see how easy and natural it is for them to live in harmony with this principle as the German church conditions seldom offer temptations for transgression; and how difficult this problem is for English Lutheran ministers, who are serving congregations which, by intermarriage and otherwise, always are in close connection with the surrounding churches. We will return to this question at the close of our article.

Let us see what we can reply to some of the criticisms that have been offered recently in our German Lutheran church papers.

Referring to the controversies on confessional matters, as we have them in the General Synod from time to time, our critics wonder how in a synod which is to represent the unity in spirit ("Einigkeit im Geist") one paper can fight the other; how at a convention there can be two factions arrayed against one another. What shall we reply to this? We might remark that it is not much different in the General Council. True, there are some synods of the extreme Lutheran wing that *seem* to have reached that unity of spirit. In their papers and at their conventions there *seems* to be no discordant note to disturb the harmony. But this word "seems" must be heavily underscored. It is only a seeming unity. The minds of these synods are constructed just as ours. They can not agree on all matters, even not on points of doctrine and practice where an agreement would be very desirable. At conferences, when discussing papers, there are always those who do not agree, and not infrequently they even dare timidly to give expression to their disagreement. But it is always dangerous to say much, and, as soon as the "popes" have given their final decision, there must always follow a retraction of the doubt expressed during the discussion. But if an onlooker happens to sit in one of the last seats he can observe that the final vote was not unanimous, a good many not having voted, and some, in the rear of the church, even showing signs of indignation. Synods of such rigorous type always make a strong impression upon many individuals and never fail to carry away all who are not strong in thinking for themselves,

and so the overwhelming influence will always be in favor of the decision rendered by the leaders. But among those who dissent in their hearts are many good men, devoted to their church, independent thinkers and holding firmly the teaching of the Word. Among them are those who go home dissatisfied, wishing that there would be more liberty of thought in the synod. I will not say that a synod where each individual can have his own way is the ideal thing, and I want it understood that it is my own conviction that in all fundamentals a church body should strive for unity of the spirit, but what I want to say here is this: the real *unity* of the spirit *does not even exist in the strictest of our Lutheran synods*. The unity is forced and therefore to a great extent only seeming, not real. The General Synod gives more liberty to the individual. An assent that is forced she does not desire. This, coupled with conditions that are explained by the history of the General Synod, accounts for many of the controversies coming up among us from time to time. The appearance is against us. We make no endeavor to conceal how much of unity on confessional questions is yet wanting among us. But we strive after it, and we have made progress, very marked progress, and we hope that we will be united more and more. Yet in striving after this unity of spirit four things must not be overlooked: (1) There will never be unity among Christians in absolutely all matters. (2) The unity of the spirit of which Paul speaks (Ephes. 4:3) can exist between brethren even if they should not agree in all the *finishes* of theology. The *fides quae creditur* must, in its rightful connection with *fides qua creditur* neither be underrated nor overrated. To overrate it is the serious mistake of the stricter Lutheran synods. (3) But even as to questions in which there ought to be a unity of the spirit in a church, it will often be "in part" only (Luther in the German Bible 1 Cor. 13:9 & 10 "Stueckwerk"); imperfect as long as we only "know in part" and "prophesy in part" and until "the perfect is come" and "that which is in part shall be done away with." (4) And where, as in the General Synod, assent is not obtained by means of force, there the imperfection of the unity of the spirit will always become more or less *evident*; while in the more rigorous synods this same imperfection exists but will be *concealed*.

This leads us to another frequent charge of our German church papers against the General Synod. They say that we know of no church discipline where doctrinal interests are at stake. But we beg to reply that this charge is unfounded in cases where deviation from orthodoxy is of the character of such fundamental errorists as the Unitarians, Universalists, Christian Scientists, etc. Where the error strikes at the foundation and rejects Christ, there our General Synod has always been on its guard. But this we admit, that, over against the errors of the Reformed churches, which leaves us Christ and his redemptive work for the salvation of sinners our General Synod is lenient; not that she endorses their errors, or approves their view of the truth for which Lutheranism stands; for her confession of the Augustana, her declaration concerning Luther's Catechism, her Ministerial Acts, her genuine Lutheran Formula of Government, are all standing testimonies against the peculiar theology of the Reformed churches. But in the General Synod it would be impossible to deal with the influences of the surrounding churches by making every individual dissenting from pure Lutheran doctrine an object of church discipline. Neither would that be in accordance with the spirit of the General Synod. She prefers another and a better way to bring all into line with her confessional basis, namely, the way of gradual education. The other synods—but again with the exception of the United Synod of the South and the English element of the Council—have here an altogether different practice. After due admonition, they proceed with excommunication against those who refuse to yield. They quote passages like these: "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject." (Tit. 3:10). "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause division and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned; and avoid them." (Rom. 16:17). But these passages do not apply to such as entertain views that are not soundly Lutheran. The apostle deals with errors that undermine the foundations, Ebionites, Gnostics and the like. He speaks of such as are frivolous in making divisions. Granted even that dissensions of the kind that exist between the Lutheran and some of the Reformed churches *do* come within the scope of the passages here quoted, then it depends upon the intention and spirit with

which an individual holds to a dissenting view. If he be conscientious and does not seek schismatic ends we will be justified in tolerantly waiting to see whether the educational influences of the church of which he is a member will not bring him out all right in the end. Here the critics of our General Synod do not take into consideration a peculiar trait of the American people. It is not strange that the English in the General Council and the United Synod of the South here agree with the General Synod. The pedagogical principles of the Americans are altogether different from those of our German people. This can be observed in the family and in the school. The American does not like disciplinary measures as long as there is hope that kind persuasion and gradual education will accomplish the same results. This principle is a characteristic trait of the whole public life in America. Much pains are taken to handle different cases in such a manner as not to make them martyrs. In hopeless cases where the German would deal with blows, the American says with cool indifference: "Give him rope, he will hang himself."¹ That American trait can be noticed in all organizations in America, just as in the Church, not that our English Lutheran churches intend to ignore the teaching of the Scriptures on church discipline. But, in charity, they hesitate long before they decide to resort to the last means, namely: excommunication from the congregation of believers. Much of what our Lutheran German papers continually criticize as not Lutheran in the General Synod is not a real difference in confessional matters, but it is an expression of this American trait of leniency toward those of her number who fail to comply with the official position of the body. A few years ago Dr. Schmauk, president of the General Council, published in the "Lutheran Church Review" an interesting article on this subject. He said in reply to an article in one of the German church papers which had demanded rigorous measures against those who were not living up to The Fundamental Principles of the Council: The church is a school and not a court house. And we should be

¹ For a full understanding of what I here mean I refer to my German pamphlet on the "Traits of the American People," in particular the fourth chapter dealing with the educational features of our country.

patient even if it should take more than a generation to accomplish the desired results.

That our General Synod in all of its members is perfect as a representation of genuine Lutheranism, the writer of this article would not affirm. Our synod has its peculiar defects and difficulties owing to influences under which we labor. As a church body she officially stands squarely and honestly on the Augsburg Confession, not on the "altered" Augustana, but, as was stated in Hagerstown and now again with much emphasis in Richmond, on the "unaltered."² And no matter how individuals among us may have expressed themselves in the past, the General Synod as a body repudiates the position that in the later confessions there are any contradictions to doctrines of the Augustana. This is not to be considered as the resolution of some conventions only, but, according to action taken at Rich-

² We can not do without that old distinction between an "altered" and an "unaltered" Augustana. I can not agree with those who say that a distinction between the "Variata" of 1540 and as "Invariata" should not be made by the Lutheran Church. Of course, the copy (Latin) in our Book of Concord, the *Editio princeps*, is not the original that was read in Augsburg, and it contains some doctrinally unimportant changes, so that it would be academically more correct to say, the Invariata *so-called*. But the Variata of 1540 omits in Article X the "*vere adsan*" and the "*improbant secus docentes*." When Calvin at the convention of Regensburg, where he was present as a delegate from Strassburg, put his signature to the Augsburg Confession, he did it with the reservation of interpreting it as Melanchthon himself had done. (*Nec vero Augstanam Confessionem repudio, cui pridem volens ac libens subscripsi, sicut eam auctor ipse interpretatus est.* So to Martin Schalling. Also in his Ultima Admonitio ad Joachim Westphalum. Comp. Salig I, 491 and Staehlin, Joh. Calvin I, 234). There are many instances where the Reformed in Germany have subscribed the Augustana for the purpose of enjoying the benefits which the Augsburg Religious Peace Treaty of 1555 conceded to all adherents of the Augustana, but, as Zoekler has pointed out in his book on the Augsburg Confession, they have always done it with the understanding that Article X (according to the reading in the Variata) *admits of a Calvinistic interpretation*. The same is true of the numerous attempts at union between the Lutherans and the Reformed in the seventeenth century. When the Reformed at such colloquies declared themselves willing to accept the Augustana they meant by it the Variata of 1540. (Comp. Zoekler pages 61 to 66). One of the first steps of Elector Sigismund, when he had joined the Reformed Church and began to introduce Calvinism into Brandenburg, was an act of displacing the so-called Invariata by the Variata of 1540. He and his Reformed advisors knew that these two documents stood for two different things. If Luther had foreseen the use made of this altered edition of the Augustana of 1540 by the opponents of the Lutheran Church he would have been opposed to it from the beginning. In judging Luther's silence on the matter there is one thing that must not be left out of consideration: The Variata appeared at a time when Luther was in a very peaceful mood toward the Zwinglians. After the Wittenberg Concord had been made in 1536 it

mond, that declaration and other confessional statements of former conventions are to be codified and made a part of our constitution.³ The confessional position of the General Synod as a body is sound. But our weakness consists in this, that, judging from voices frequently heard in our church papers, there are those among us who do not agree with the confessional declarations given by the several conventions of the General Synod. They think that it is the mission of the General Synod over against the Concordia Lutherans to represent a Melanchthonian Lutheranism; a type of Lutheranism that leaves its boundaries with the Reformed churches as much as possible in an undefined condition. It is this existing difference between

seemed that there was a chance that, after all, both sides might come together on the doctrine of the Real Presence. And during the following years Luther wrote some very sweet letters to his opponents in the South. It was at that time when the Variata appeared, voicing the peaceful sentiments of Luther by leaving out the "improbatio" and omitting even the "vere adscit." Considering the stand which Luther took in favor of the strongest expression possible (regarding the Real Presence) in the Smalkald Articles (1537) the omission of the "vere adscit" can not have been in harmony with Luther's wishes, but he simply tolerated the change for the sake of not disturbing a development that might result in doing away with a schism in Protestantism. But more and more Luther found that he was deceived. Zwingli was dead, but Calvin's influence was growing, and his seemingly mediating views took with many in South Germany and were fascinating even to Melanchthon. Reports were circulated that Luther had abandoned his doctrine of the Real Presence. Now Luther breaks his silence. He is near his grave, and he does not want his followers to be deceived by the report that he ever yielded to Zwinglianism or even to Calvinism. In 1544, two years before his death, he writes as a testament to posterity his "Minor Confession of the Lord's Supper" establishing in the strongest terms his old doctrine of the Real Presence. At this time Luther came near writing also against Melanchthon, but he yielded to the wishes of the Elector who dreaded such discord in his university. (Compare the thorough investigations of Planck on this subject). We are safe in following Rudelbach, Zoekler, Kolde, Seeburg and a host of Lutheran scholars in believing that in the Variata of 1540 we have the embryonic beginnings of a theology that in the interest of unionism deviated from genuine Lutheranism. And since the Variata, after the conflicts between the Flacianists and the Melanchthonians and in view of the use that the German Reformed have always made of it, has come to stand for a type of Lutheranism which, as much as possible, attempts to ignore the difference with Calvinism, a Synod, especially in the free church of America, is almost compelled to establish itself on the Invariata. Such men as Strobel, Rueckert or Heppe, who have written much on this subject, are not safe leaders. They were extreme Melanchthonians and wrote to pave the way for the Prussian union or to vindicate that movement.

³ This does not mean that they have no binding authority until this is done. Compare the declaration of the General Synod at Richmond on this matter given below.

the General Synod *as such* and a circle of its members, whose sincerity we will not impeach, which is the source of that confessional restlessness among us which manifests itself in periodical eruptions, the injurious effects of which have not infrequently been felt in the life of our General body. The brethren among us who stand for this Melanchthonian type of Lutheranism are constantly aided in their views by the effects of the history of our General Synod especially in the fifties of the last century. The example of a venerable father always continues for generations to influence the children and to sanction the views of an age gone by. We must not speak disparagingly of these fathers. We can understand how they arrived at a type of Lutheranism that is now more and more discredited among us. The Lutheran church was rapidly finding its way into the English language, and, in the attempt to secure for her a place among other English Protestant churches of this new country, our fathers, observing the kind of Lutheranism established by the Missouri Synod and kindred bodies, thought that it would be a wise policy for the General Synod to stand for a Lutheranism "modified by the Puritan element," which in theology is Melanchthonianism. It was a mistake. Reaction followed in due time, and has grown stronger from decade to decade. It is in the nature of the Lutheran Church, by a slow but sure development, to free herself from elements that are foreign to her principles and her genius. Especially under free church conditions the development of our Church is bound to take that course. Many years ago Dr. Wolf, of Gettysburg, wrote in the *Lutheran Evangelist*, then edited by Dr. Ort, five articles on Melanchthonian Lutheranism which he showed to have always been a failure in the history of our Church. The General Synod, in the position she takes officially, is all right to-day. The criticisms in the German papers of Missouri, Joint Synod of Ohio, etc., which usually follow the conventions of our body, as after the convention in Richmond, need not disturb us. Our opponents have developed a wonderful virtuosity in picking up an article or a sentence from some individual in some private paper or a remark uttered by some one on the floor of the General Synod and then using it to characterize the whole body.

A remarkable performance of this kind has recently taken

place in the Missouri Synod. The book of Johnannes Grosse, Addison, Ill., "Unterscheilungslehren" (Distinguishing Doctrines of the Principal Synods that call themselves *Lutheran*, etc.) has just been issued in its fourth edition.⁴ This book, abounding in distortions and misrepresentations of all Lutheran bodies in this country, undertakes to characterize the General Synod in the following manner:

(1) After Dr. Seiss of the General Council, just on the preceding pages, has been treated again and again as an arch-heretic, he is quoted, in one of his older controversial writings ("The Javelin"), as an authority against the Lutheran character of the General Synod: "The General Synod as such has no doctrine." (Javelin p. 225). "Her so-called doctrinal basis is simply a Nonens." (p. 221). So Dr. Seiss, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Ministerium delegation that withdrew at Fort Wayne in 1866, wrote soon after the rupture in the heat of the battle that followed the organization of the General Council. A good many things were said at that time that were lacking the cool deliberation that must characterize a statement of lasting value. At the meeting of the General Synod at York, Pa., 1902, this same Dr. Seiss was the delegate of the Council to the General Synod; and he preached the principal sermon on the synodical Sunday and participated with his General Synod brethren in the Lord's Supper.

(2) In order to depreciate the weight of the General Synod's confessional paragraph, attention is called to the "Word of God as contained in the canonical writings," etc. This phrase was never meant to express a rationalistic idea. But to avoid all misunderstanding the General Synod, at her last convention in Richmond, adopted a different phraseology ("is the Word of God," etc.).

(3) Much space is taken by Rev. Grosse to show that the General Synod in accepting the Augsburg Confession limits it to the fundamental doctrines. To substantiate this, a number of quotations from Dr. S. S. Schmucker are given. Also a statement of Dr. Brown in the Allentown church case, who said that he did not regard all things taught in the Augsburg Confession

⁴ On former editions see my "Brief History of the Luth. Church in America," p. 18.

as in accordance with the Scripture. But over against these personal opinions stands, since 1901, the declaration of the General Synod at the convention in Des Moines, that "to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis"—the basis of the General Synod—"as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription." This was repeated with much emphasis again at the last convention in Richmond. Now should not the declarations of two conventions of the General Synod where she undertakes to explain the meaning of her confessional basis have more weight than the private utterances of some of her members? It has been objected to this Des Moines resolution by our opponents that it does not have the force of a constitutional amendment, having never been formally adopted by two-thirds of the synods, according to the constitutional requirement (Art. VI, Sec. 2) and therefore is not a part of the doctrinal basis. But to this the General Synod replied in Richmond, "that the section above cited refers only to *alterations* of the General Synod's constitution; but the confessional resolutions referred to are not alterations of the constitution, and contemplate no alterations; they are simply explanations of the meaning of the General Synod's confessional basis. Therefore, it is not necessary to submit them to the District Synods of the General Synod. Inasmuch, then, as they were passed by the General Synod in regular session and have never been revoked by this body, they therefore become and remain a part of the confessional assets of the General Synod."⁵ What are we to say of a writer who publishes a book on the Lutheran synods of this country, a book that is to go out as an instructor of thousands of ministers and laymen that utterly ignores all the official declarations of a body and simply for the purpose of discrediting it, characterizes it by private utterances made in an age gone by? In order to quiet his conscience the author calls attention to the fact that in the newest edition of our Book of Worship the words "fundamental doctrines"⁶ are printed in italics, and this he takes

5 See Proceedings of the 44th Convention of the General Synod, in session at Richmond, Ind., June 2-10, 1909.

6 Compare on page 200 the confessional paragraph of our Constitution as a heading over the Augsburg Confession.

as an official declaration of the General Synod that she yet believes in the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of the Augustana. But he conceals from his readers (1) that not only this phrase, but a good many other phrases of this confessional passage are also in italics, the idea being simply to indicate by print all the essential parts of our doctrinal basis; (2) that not only the two words "fundamental doctrines" are underscored, but the "fundamental doctrines *of the Divine Word*" which, according to the declaration of the General Synod "means precisely what she (the Synod) says, namely, that the fundamental doctrines of God's Word are correctly set forth in the Confession. She does not mean that some of the doctrines set forth in the Confession are non-fundamental, and, therefore, may be accepted or rejected."⁷ And still more to make the defeat of Rev. Johannes Grosse of Addison, Ill., as complete as possible: the General Synod, at her convention in Richmond, ordered that the Des Moines resolution stating that no distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession shall be made, shall from now on "with headings prefixed, be printed in all future editions of the Augsburg Confession published by the General Synod whether issued in separate form or in our Books of Worship."⁸ After this resolution was passed the other resolution was adopted to order the committee on "The Common Service" to codify and incorporate the substance of all the several resolutions and statements explanatory of the doctrinal basis into one clear and definite statement. We would like to know what Rev. Grosse and the faculty of the Missourian Seminary in St. Louis which, according to a note, assisted him in editing the book, has to say to all this? The Missouri Synod's monthly, "*Lehre und Wehre*," was among the first to comment on the Richmond resolutions. Why have they not been considered in this book? If the Missourians think that there is yet an element in the General Synod that does not agree with these Hagerstown-Des Moines-Richmond resolutions and that it may take some time before they have the full and hearty approval of

⁷ Proceedings of Richmond, p. 57.

⁸ See Proceedings, p. 59.

all, let them state *that*, and we would not have objected; but we do object to such a piece of gross deception as displayed in this book of Grosse!

(4) The author of the book under review quotes an anonymous writer who in 1875, in a German pamphlet, made the statement that the General Synod knew herself to be *in harmony with most of the principles of the Prussian union*. We know that pamphlet. Every one who reads it can see what the writer means. He simply believes that his synod endorses most of the confessional principles of the Lutherans in the Prussian union—not all of them, for instance, their objectionable principle that Lutherans and Reformed might exist under one church government. Rev. Grosse quotes from that pamphlet to show that the General Synod is a unionistic body. But even if this writer says something amiss, what responsibility has the General Synod of to-day for the statements of a pamphlet published in 1875. Rev. Grosse, in his attempt to characterize the different Lutheran bodies of our country employs a method that is ridiculous. He quotes some one on a question of doctrine or practice, and no matter whether this was adopted by the synod or not the synod is responsible for it, and is a reliable expression of the position of the synod. This method is misleading in the highest degree. This is a new country. All the different types of Lutheranism which history has developed in the Fatherland are represented here in as many synods. The exchange of views in Church papers, the contact between the several synods on the field naturally leads to constant self-examination. So the synods develop. We learn from others; others learn from us. Therefore such methods as are used by Grosse are absolutely unreliable. What was true some twenty-five years ago does not apply to conditions of to-day. The Tennessee Synod used to fight the North Carolina Synod; to-day both synods belong to the same general body. Thus many synods have changed more or less. Here a remark in passing: The Missourians consider the General Synod responsible for such utterances of individuals *because she did not make them objects of church discipline*. Grosse quotes Dr. Brown on the distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals in the Augustana, and then says: "And for such statements sworn

to by the professor, he was not disciplined nor removed, but remained teacher of theology in the General Synod until 1881." But let me reply: I heard Dr. F. Pieper of St. Louis say, at the Inter-synodical Conference in Detroit, when pressed about the extremely predestinarian utterances of Dr. Walther:⁹ "We do not endorse everything Dr. Walther has said." But why was Dr. Walther not disciplined if he on such a doctrine, in the official paper of the Synod,¹⁰ and in other important documents, made statements which the synod can not endorse? Is there a difference in the two cases?

(5) A few words more and we are done with this book. On page 67 Rev. Grosse tries to prove the "unionistic" character of the General Synod by stating that in her Ministerial Acts (*Agende*) she does not use a Lutheran form of distribution (*Spendeformel*) when celebrating the Lord's Supper; that she is simply using Christ's words of institution as is done "in all the *unierte Agenden*," thus leaving it to the communicant whether he wants to put a Lutheran or a Reformed construction upon the words recited. But here this writer seems to have failed to examine for himself the only official "Ministerial Acts" as adopted in 1899 in York, Pa. There he can read on page 60 the forms of distribution exactly as they were used in the old Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century. While we believe that here the author is the victim of mere error, yet we feel constrained to ask: Shall this fourth edition now go out into the thousands of homes and pastor's studies to misrepresent the General Synod and to create prejudice against her? This is a serious question! The misrepresentations which this book contains ought to trouble the conscience of a normal Christian. And if account has to be rendered some day for every idle word, how much more for words perpetuated in a book and sent out as a guide for the Church!

But how did we get into this discussion of Rev. Grosse's book? We used it as an illustration of the methods resorted to by our critics to prove that the General Synod is not Lutheran. Here

⁹ See some of them in my "Brief History," p. 123.

¹⁰ Proceedings of Western District, 1877.

is another instance. The "*Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*" (Joint Synod of Ohio) declared some time ago that the General Synod does not even accept the Augsburg Confession. As reason for this was offered an unfavorable critique of Dr. Loy's book on the Augsburg Confession that had appeared in the *Lutheran Observer*. But that review, though written as it seemed with strong feeling of aversion against the spirit of the book, was no rejection of the Augustana. The principal objection of the *Observer* to Dr. Loy's book was this, that it seemed to show hardly a trace of familiarity with modern theological thought, even not with that of a decidedly Lutheran stamp. If the writer of this review, by the word "modern" which offends the *Luth. Kirchenzeitung* as smacking of Unitarianism, simply meant—as we understood it—that Dr. Loy, in his exposition of the articles of the Augustana, has ignored the development of confessional theology as represented by the men of the Erlangen school (v. Hofmann, Thomasius, Delitzsch, Frank, Luthart, Ihmels, etc.) then this needed not to sound so terrible in the ears of the writer in the *Kirchenzeitung*! For between the theology of the sixteenth century and most of these men just mentioned there is no material, but merely a formal difference. The difference is in forms of thought, in "Gedankenformen." The *Lutheran Observer* does not favor modern theology in the sense of Socinianism. But now as to Dr. Loy's exposition of the Augustana, it cannot be denied that his book moves exclusively in the forms of thought of the theology of the sixteenth century, ever accumulating the expressions coined by that age. I want to say here that I did not hesitate to recommend Dr. Loy's book warmly to the readers of the "*Zions-Bote*." Written in edificational form for the people, we considered it a valuable contribution to the practical literature of our Church, even if, here and there, there is an underlying principle that we can not approve. There is an element of power in the sixteenth century edificational reproductions that makes itself felt on almost every page of this book. Yet it reflects the peculiar confessional and religious life of the Synod of which the author is an honored leader; and if a paper of the General Synod criticises such elements we say, first, that this is no rejection of the Augustana, and, secondly, we protest

when, on the basis of such a review, the attitude of the General Synod to the Augsburg Confession is discredited.

All such criticisms of the General Synod can not stand the light of a thorough examination. Our opponents may be able to say something concerning practice that will apply to individual cases here and there, but what they say against the General Synod and against her doctrinal position are merely soap bubbles which explode as soon as they are touched. As a synod we have made progress. The resolutions on our confessional basis presented at Richomnd by Dr. Keyser and adopted by an overwhelming majority, not in a rush, but after a discussion, and after motions to refer and to lay on the table had been voted down, was a magnificent step forward not in the way of changing our doctrinal standpoint, but in the way of a clear and precise definition of how our old confessional paragraph is to be understood.¹¹ It is a document that covers in small print five

¹¹ Some may think that the whole phraseology of our confessional form of subscription should have been given up because of the misconstructions it has been subjected to in the past by our own men. Such may be the outcome when the General Synod comes to adopt the report of her Common Service Committee which is to "codify the several resolutions" and to "incorporate the substance of the same into one clear and definite statement of our doctrinal basis." But we insist that while this may be the outcome, our confessional paragraph as we have it now is not misleading and objectionable in itself. It is carrying something into it, which was not thought of by the composers, to interpret it as Dr. S. S. Schmucker and his followers have done. To an innocent reader the words "and the Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word" suggest no distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines. It may suggest the idea that in the Augustana, as well as in any creed, there are human elements which are not included in the subscription. For instance, when Melanchthon said at the close of the first twenty-one articles: "This is about the sum of our doctrines from which it is evident that they contain nothing inconsistent with the Scriptures, or with either the Catholic or the Roman Church, so far as is known from the (ancient) writers (or fathers)," so we know now that, even if Melanchthon did not mean more than that, the Church of the first five centuries was in full accord with all the Lutheran positions, this was an overstatement; for the Roman Catholic leaven was much older than Melanchthon, in the Augustana, was willing to admit. (See Prof. Kawerau's letter in the Holman Lecture in July number of the *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, 1909, p. 330). But such and other things do not affect the confessional substance, the "fundamental doctrines of the divine word" as set forth in the Augsburg Confession. This is, in negative respects, the only thing that an innocent mind will find in the General Synod's confessional form of subscription. Therefore, it is in itself unobjectionable, even if the phraseology should never be changed. This is a reminder to those who, like "*Lehre und Wahrheit*," intend to question the formal correctness of our confessional paragraph until the General Synod has adopted something else.

pages in the "Proceedings" of the Richmond convention and deserves to be read and studied by all of our members and especially by those in other Lutheran bodies who wish to pass judgment on the Lutheranism of the General Synod. When "F. B." the valiant critic of all churches in "*Lehre und Wehre*" first saw these Richmond resolutions he seemed to be speechless, but after he had gotten breath again he consoled his heart by saying that this does not make the General Synod Lutheran. It depends upon, he said, what she actually *is* (the "Sein") and not upon what she *seems to be* (the "Schein"). Yes, but during many years "*Lehre und Wehre*" has tried to discredit us by saying that we did not accept the unaltered Augsburg Confession; that we distinguished between fundamentals and non-fundamentals in the Augustana; and that we assumed an attitude of indifference, if not of hostility, to the Form of Concord. By the Richmond statements which the General Synod declares to be binding without submission to any district synod, because they are "no alterations," but "simply explanations of the meaning of the General Synod's basis," the General Synod has made it impossible for all right-minded men to disparage her doctrinal position. That the adoption of this document does not at once bring every member into full sympathy with the spirit and theology of the contents of those resolutions, we know well enough—such is always a slow process; but let us understand that, *our ideal of Lutheranism is not that of the Missouri Synod*. There is a difference of opinion between us concerning that "Sein" of which "*Lehre und Wehre*" speaks.

Our critics invite the Wartburg and German Nebraska Synods to sever their connection with the General Synod. It cannot be denied that there is something not quite natural in the synodical connection between purely English and purely German elements. It frequently means on the part of the Germans, who are in the minority, a yielding to methods which they hesitate to adopt. But they are in America, and they come to learn that new methods, if they only do not overthrow the principles of our confession, are adiaphora. And what, in moments of discouragement, has always helped to make our Germans contented with their synodical connection is this continual growth of Lutheran consciousness of which almost every convention of the General

Synod has given evidence these many years. A synod of the importance of the General Synod and developing in the direction indicated deserves to be strengthened instead of weakened by withdrawals. In addition to this, history, and especially the history of the Lutheran Church in America, shows by a good many illustrations that a church body should hesitate long before it decides to sever its synodical connection. Take, for instance, the Michigan Synod. Twenty-three years ago she was a district synod of the General Council. Because a prominent member of the General Council had spoken, at a convention of that body, in the pulpit of a Presbyterian church, the Michigan Synod left the Council and joined the Wisconsin Synod which is a part of the Synodical Conference. But soon she found herself in war with Wisconsin and severed her connection with that body for "doctrinal reasons," as was announced. A considerable part of the ministers and the congregations decided to remain in the Wisconsin Synod. In such a decimated condition Michigan then existed for quite a number of years, endeavoring to support a Seminary, but torn by internal troubles. Finally the little synod decided to return again with a *pater peccavi* to Wisconsin. The story of this synod is certainly a warning not to take lightly the severing of a synodical connection. Michigan should have remained in the Council. Her withdrawal has altogether lacked the sanction of divine blessings. Such seasons of withdrawal are fraught with scandalous occurrences that have a confusing effect upon many for whose spiritual welfare a synod bears the responsibility. Christ says, "Woe unto the world because of the offenses! For it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh!" True, there can be conditions of such a kind that withdrawal becomes a most sacred duty, as was the case at the time of the Reformation. But conditions as they existed then our opponents should not put in comparison with imperfections such as are found in the General Synod, imperfections that exist in every synod in one way or another, which gradually can be overcome by the faithful co-operation of its members.

Our opponents fail to see the point where the Germans of the General Synod are in harmony with the confessional principles of the body to which they belong. There is a dividing princi-

ple between the people of the General Synod, even of the most conservative of them, and the German Lutheran synods that are engaged in this constant warfare against us. What is it? It is not the doctrine of justification by faith, not the doctrine concerning the means of grace. But what is it? Wherein do our views differ from theirs? It is concerning the Church, and in particular concerning the visible Church. Our opponents show by their practice and by the spirit of their polemics their belief that the Lutheran Church alone has a right to exist. They treat all other denominations *without discrimination* as sects and wilful errorists to whom the words of Scripture quoted before apply, "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject." (Tit. 3:10). And, "Now I beseech you, brethren mark them which cause division and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned; and avoid them." (Rom. 16:17). We in the General Synod—the German districts included—take here a position different from our critics. We, of course, reject all who undermine the foundation, who have given up Christ and ignore his redemptive work. But in speaking of the others we discriminate between "sects" that have organized on hooks and buttons, on beards and shaving, on seventh or first day, and between such churches that owe their existence to a reaction of the sound body against evils that had begun to overpower and to paralyze the Christian Church of a country. We are not blind to some very deplorable errors that these churches entertain on a good many subjects of even fundamental importance, and we regret that they do not accept our system of doctrines which we have learned to know as scriptural. But neither do we want to be blind to the fact that as churches they believe in the Bible as God's Word; in the Trinity and in a divine Savior of sinful man. So we call them churches that have a right to exist—a right to exist to the degree they represent saving biblical truth, and we believe that they are recognized by the Head of the Church as agents in the work of saving souls. This our opponents regard as the root of all unionism. But the General Synod is also opposed to unionism. She will reject unionism as soon as the proposition is made that she as a Lutheran body and entrusted with the care for our Lutheran faith shall enter into organic union with a church holding to a

creed that does not agree with the Augsburg Confession. *The Lutheran Evangelist* in its dying hours suggested again and again that the General Synod should unite with the "German Evangelical Synod of America," a body which stands for the principle: organic union between Lutherans and Reformed on the basis of an indifference as to the dividing doctrines of the two churches. The German Evangelical Synod declares in its confessional paragraph its acceptance of the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism, *but together with the Reformed Heidelberg Catechism, and where these two confessions disagree, liberty on the basis of the Scriptures shall be given to both views.* Now whenever the proposition to unite with this body should come before the General Synod it would be found that she rejects unionism. She will never accept anything less than the Augsburg Confession, nor will she unite with a body that limits the obligation to the Augustana to the elements that we have in common with the Reformed Churches.

Yet though we disapprove of a union with the Reformed Churches before an agreement on the dividing doctrines has been reached, we say that in the same measure as they stand for biblical and saving truth they have a right to exist. While this was contested by the Lutherans in the time of the Reformation, who feared that the spiritualism of the Reformed (which is the root of their conception of the sacraments), would lead them into all the aberrations of Carlstadt and the Anabaptists and other enthusiasts of that age—I say, while the Lutherans of the sixteenth century thought that the subjectivism of the Reformed was bound to lead to a dissolution of the Church, history has proved another thing and has vindicated their right to be recognized. These considerations lead the English of the General Synod to the admission of an *occasional* church fellowship with the Reformed Church and some of her daughters. The German District Synods of our General Synod have taken their position on the Galesburg Rule. But that they are, nevertheless, in harmony with the principle of the General Synod can be seen from the reasons which they give for adopting the Galesburg Rule. They are fundamentally different from the arguments of the synods of the extreme Lutheran wing. They do not base their rule on those passages: "A man that is an heretic

.... reject," and "avoid them." The reasons why our German districts disapprove of pulpit and altar fellowship with the Reformed Churches are the following: (1) It is misleading to the congregations, because in most cases an impression is created that existing doctrinal differences are of little importance; and (2) our German Synods, under their conditions, find that such practice breaks down their work. If, for instance, they practice church fellowship with the German Evangelical Synod, our German congregations take it as a suggestion that in a case of vacancy they may also call a minister from that quarter. We have lost large congregations in that way. The position of our Germans in the church fellowship question is about that of the so-called Akron resolutions which read as follows: (1) The rule is: Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran ministers only. Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only. (2) The exceptions to the rule belong to the sphere of privilege, not of right. (3) The determination of the exceptions is to be made in consonance with these principles, by the conscientious judgment of pastors, as they arise.

Our German brethren feel that this position can only be taken in full harmony with the principle of the General Synod to recognize the Reformed denominations as churches that have a right to exist. We should not fellowship with the other churches in such a manner as to practically deny the doctrines for which our Church stands, nor should we do anything to create the impression as if the points of difference between us were of no importance. But I will admit that there are cases where we can preach in other pulpits without betraying the truth committed to our care. Julius Stahl, the able defender of the Lutheran Church in Prussia against the Union, says, "I have heard the Lutherans Harless and Loehe preach in the pulpit of the Reformed minister Krafft, and again have I seen Krafft with his powerful message in the Lutheran pulpit, for the last time at the jubilee in Erlangen." (Lutherische Kirche und Union, 2d ed., p. 437). A compromise of their confessional position could not be expected of such staunch Lutherans as Harless and Loehe. Such are not isolated cases, but frequent occurrences even in the strictly Lutheran provinces of the Fatherland. Of course, the question of fellowshipping at the altar has always been regarded

a little different by the Lutherans in Germany. Here where we have the culmination of divine service, the Lutheran Church has always been especially careful that such only who can agree in the doctrine of the sacrament should commune together; and she would not admit such from other churches who consciously reject the Lutheran conception. When Luther and Melanchthon at Marburg were in conference with Zwingli and his adherents, the Swiss reformers suggested the celebration of the communion before parting. But Luther and Melanchthon both regretted that they could not. Because of Luther's remark: "Ye have another spirit than we," it has often been thought that it must have been a stormy conference. But it was not. In recent investigations¹² it has been pointed out in what a peaceful mood especially Luther was. In all his letters, for instance to his wife, he is full of hope for a perfect union. Yet his conscience forbids him the celebration of the communion, because an agreement has not yet been reached. The mild Melanchthon takes the same position and wonders in his correspondence and can not explain it to his own satisfaction why the Zwinglians wanted a celebration of the communion in spite of the failure to reach an agreement on this very doctrine.¹³ I quote this simply to show historically that this conviction, on which there has been so much discussion, existed in our Church from the beginning. This was in 1529. And in 1536 there was another occasion when Luther showed exactly the same attitude. Not before an agreement had been reached with Bucer and the others from Strassburg, in the Wittenberg Concord, did Luther celebrate with them the Lord's Supper. And turning some leaves of history, let me point to another man whom we will be inclined to regard as an authority on this question because we know that he was not narrow, but had a wide and warm heart for all children of God. I mean Spener. These are his words, "Because the communion with a congregation includes that one approves of the doctrine of this same congregation especially in the article of such sacrament.... therefore I can not see how we can take the communion in those churches whose doctrine of the

12 Comp. Schubert in the *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte* 1908, p. 354.

13 Realencyclopaedie, 3rd ed., XII, 254. Corp. Ref. II, 1108.

communion we ourselves believe and profess not to be correct, thus giving one testimony with our mouth and another with our act.....Therefore is this doctrine the most manifest partition-wall between the two churches. How can we then have a communion (*gemeines Mahl*) together?¹⁴ Of course, it must be admitted, that even regarding the Lord's Supper¹⁵ cases must be considered individually. There may be good Lutherans outside of the Lutheran Church who happen to be in other churches, but who are one with us in faith, and who, even if they can not give a clear definition of our doctrine, yet do not object to the Real Presence and positively regard the Lord's Supper as a means of grace. But the conscientious minister feels that there is something wrong if some of the communicants believe in the Real Presence of the glorified God-Man and his body to be given to the penitent and believing soul for the forgiveness of sins, and others positively reject such doctrine, holding that the elements are nothing but remembrances of an absent Savior and symbols of a grace received before, or that may be received sometime in the future. Such would be no real communion. And I am glad that the General Synod, in the adoption of her "Ministerial Acts" in 1899 in York, omitted that general invitation to all members of other churches in good standing or to all who love the Lord Jesus, which adorned our old formulas as expressions of indifferentism in so important a doctrine.

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

14 Letzte theologische Bedenken II, 43 seq., III, 81. 83 seq.

15 Do not overlook that Spener speaks of Lutherans seeking the communion in other churches.

ARTICLE III.

THE PROPHET AMOS.

BY REV. HENRY W. A. HANSON.

THE BOOK OF AMOS.

Our knowledge of the prophet Amos is derived entirely from the book which bears his name. In the Hebrew Canon we find it placed third, in the Septuagint second, among the minor prophets. The text of the book is one of the best preserved of the prophetic books. The number of passages disputed by modern criticism is comparatively small.

The book of Amos merits particular attention since it is here that we find in their original freshness all of the fundamental truths emphasized by the later prophets.¹

The influence of the message of Amos upon subsequent prophets is frequently traceable through similarity of expression. Yet as President Harper suggests,² we find the more marked traces of that influence in their attitude "In standing aloof from the great body of the so-called prophets in their respective periods; in adopting the method of writing down their utterances; in the continued development of the sermonic discourse introduced by him; in following the fashion of directing a certain part of their attention to the foreign nations; in basing their work on the fundamental doctrine of national judgment as presented by Amos; in holding up and completing the new ideas propounded by Amos concerning God and his ethical demands upon humanity." In the book of Ecclesiasticus (B. C. 190-170)³ mention is made of the "twelve prophets," from which we infer that the author knew of the prophet Amos. In the book of Tobit (first or second century B. C.)⁴ we read: "Then I remembered and washed myself and ate my meat in heaviness,

1 Cornill—"Einleitung in d. Kanon." Bücher d. A. T. s. 204.

2 Com. on Amos and Hosea, p. 137 of the Introduction.

3 Schürer—"Gesch. des Jüdischen Volkes in za. Jesu Christ." 3 aufl. Band III, s. 159.

4 Ditto, p. 176.

remembering the prophecy of Amos, as he said, Your feasts shall be turned into mourning, and all your mirth into lamentation." (Tob. 2:5-6, see Amos 8:10).

New Testament quotations from the book of Amos are as follows: Acts 7:42 from Am. 5:25. Acts 15:16 from 9:11. Rev. 10:7 (c and d) from Am. 3:7. The Septuagint rendering of Amos 4:13 is indirectly quoted seven times in the book of Revelation as follows: In Rev. 11:17; 15:3; 16:7; 16:14; 19:6; 19:15; and 21:22.

THE AGE.

The period of Israel's history within which the ministry of Amos falls can be definitely fixed, thanks to the precision of the superscription of the book. It was in the days of Uzziah, (c. 801-749 B. C.), and of Jeroboam II (c. 804-763 B. C.), probably about the year 760 B. C., when the shepherd of Tekoa entered upon his prophetic activity.⁵ The dating of the book is made yet more precise by the last clause of the superscription: "Two years before the earthquake." The natural inference, in reading these lines, is, that the prophet looks back upon the event as one occupying a vivid place in the memory of his age. The earthquake is referred to, not merely as a phenomenon of rare occurrence, but probably, in this case, because of its exceptional violence.⁶

CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS.

Israel was no longer dominated by foreign influence as we find it in the Tell Amarna period. The development of a national policy had gone hand in hand with the unfolding of a national life. Israel had long since become a people with traditions, prin-

⁵ Prof. Kirkpatrick suggests in "The Doctrine of the Prophets," p. 82, "We shall not be far wrong if we place the ministry of Amos in the second half of Jeroboam's reign."

⁶ That such is the case is rendered extremely probable by the additional reference found in Zech. 14:5—"Ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the face of the earthquake in the days of Uzziah the king of Judah." Reference to this catastrophe is found in Josephus, (*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 9, Chapt. 10, sec. 4), who attributes it to the king's sacrilege in usurping the priestly office.

ciples and a spirit of its own. During the reign of Jehoahaz (c. 815-798 B. C.), the northern kingdom suffered severe reverses. Hazael of Damascus conquered all of the district east of the Jordan and pushed his conquests across the Jordan into the territory of Manasseh (2 Kings 10:32-33). He captured Gath (2 Kings 17:12), and Jerusalem was saved only at the expense of the temple and palace treasures, with which Jehoash staid the conqueror's approach (2 Kings 12-18). The national resources and vigor were reduced to such a low ebb that it seemed for a time as though very little was needed to annihilate the tottering regime (2 Kings 13:7-22). An idea of Israel's military strength at this time can be gathered from the statement that there were left to Jehoahaz, the king, "but 50 horsemen, 10 chariots, and 10,000 footmen, for the king of Syria destroyed them." (2 Kings 13:7). To render matters all the more foreboding there came, at this time, a revival of Asherah worship. (2 Kings 13:6). Israel seemed hopelessly adrift politically, socially and religiously.

The king, we read in 2 Kings 13:4-5, placed the needs of the land in prayer before Jehovah and besought him that Israel's curse might be removed. In answer to his prayer we read that God raised up a Saviour who delivered them from Syrian oppression.⁷

In Jehoash, son of Jehoahaz, Israel possessed a ruler of unusual ability. A suggestive glimpse of his reign is found in combining 2 Kings 13:10-25 and 2 Kings 14:8-16 (see also 2 Ch. 25:17-24). Taking advantage of the suspension of hostilities on the part of Damascus, he so developed the resources of Israel that we later find him defeating Benhadad III, son of Hazael in three distinct campaigns; thereby regaining for Israel all of the territory lost during the disastrous reign of his father Jehoahaz. (2 Kings 13:25).

⁷ The reference is to Rimmon Nirari, king of Assyria (812-783 B. C.), who plundered Damascus in 805 B. C., thus putting an end to its tyrannous rule over Israel. "I marched against (the land of asses) Damascus, and shut up Mari' the king of Damascus, in his capitol city: the fear of the splendor of Asur his Lord struck him to the ground—he embraced my feet and surrendered himself. 2300 talents of silver, 20 talents of gold, 3000 talents of copper, 5000 talents of iron, variegated garments, clothing materials, a bed of ivory, a sedan-chair with ivory frame-work, his goods and countless possessions, I seized in his residence, Damascus, in the midst of his palace." Inscription of Rimmon-Nirari 111. See Keilinschrifliche Bibliothek, Band 1, S. 191.

In the third year of the reign of Jehoash, Amaziah succeeded his father Joash as king of Judah. Amaziah's rule was characterized by an aggressive policy. Edom had enjoyed independence since the days of Jehoram (849-842 B. C.). Living in the clefts about their capitol Sela, they seemed safe from invasion. Their capitol was situated about 70 miles south of the Dead Sea in the heart of a district approachable only by the most difficult mountain climbing. Located as they were, it was but natural that they should boast of their safety from all attack, and that they should defy their enemies to conquer them. (*Obad. 1:3*). Even so perilous an undertaking did not cause Amaziah to hesitate. Securing 100,000 mercenaries from Israel (2 Ch. 25:6), he plunged into the mountain defiles of the Edomites, defeated their army, plundered their city, confiscated their wealth and seized their gods. Ten thousand prisoners he brutally hurled over the precipices and "broke to pieces." (2 Kings 14:7 and 2 Ch. 25:11-12).

But before the campaign against Edom had been fairly launched, a "man of God" came to Amaziah and counselled him to send back the 100,000 mercenaries, giving as his reason that "Jehovah is not with Israel, to wit, with all the children of Ephraim." (2 Ch. 25:7). The advice was followed and the men of Israel were instructed to return to their land. Enraged at such capricious treatment the men of Israel returned in "fierce anger"—they fell upon the cities along their route and plundered them. Three thousand cities of Judah we are told, were laid waste by this enraged band of lawless soldiery. (2 Ch. 25:13). As soon as the conquest of Edom was accomplished Amaziah turned his attention to avenging this act of rapine. It proved a very unfortunate step for Judah. Jehoash, busily engaged in developing the resources of his realm was very loath to enter upon any unnecessary military projects. But Amaziah's insistence drew him into the field. The army of Judah was utterly overthrown and Jehoash, following up the victory, pushed on and captured Jerusalem. The city was plundered, the temple sacked, and, in order to insure Judah's future fidelity to its treaty of peace with Israel, hostages were taken. (2 Ch. 25:24).

The touching scenes surrounding the close of Elisha's life (2 Kings 13:14-20), make it difficult for us to understand the state-

ment which sums up the sixteen years of Jehoash's reign with the words, "And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." (2 Kings 13:11). As Elisha lies upon his death bed, the king Jehoash comes to him for a farewell blessing. He weeps over his approaching death, and likens the dying prophet to "the chariot and horsemen of Israel"—its glory and strength. He comes to the prophet as to one with whom he was on the best of terms. That he might rest within the reach of any cooling breath of air that stirred, his couch had been placed near the lattice window. Elisha bids the king throw open the window and bend his bow—his own feeble hands were laid upon those of the king and he bade him shoot. Three times the king bent his bow and sent an arrow winging its way through the air—then he stopped; alas all too soon! The arrows had been the sign of approaching deliverance—each one shot had been a pledge or prophecy of victory—Syria was now to be thrice defeated but not crushed.

Thus we see Jehoash collecting the scattered forces of Israel, defeating its hostile neighbors, thereby affording its resources opportunity to recuperate. About the year 804 B. C., king Jehoash died, leaving the realm in the hands of his son Jeroboam, II, under whom Israel reached a degree of prosperity and splendor unequalled since the days of Solomon.

Syria had been crippled through the campaigns of Shalmaneser III, and Assurdan. Uzziah of Judah, a king of no mean ability, was too busy resuscitating his wasted land to think of waging war with Israel—then too Judah's hostages were still at the court of Jeroboam! Assyria, after enjoying a period of unwonted vigor and achievement, began to decline. Its feeble home rule⁸ rendered it impossible for Assyria to direct very much attention along the Mediterranean coast. Phoenicia weakened by the attacks of Assyria, was now rent with civil strife. Under the 22nd (Libyan) Dynasty—945 to 745 B. C.—a process of disintegration was at work in Egypt which eventually reduced what had once been a world power, to a nation made up of petty States. During this period Egypt was rent with interneccine strife and could not interfere with Syrian affairs.

⁸ This condition of affairs existed from the death of Rimmon-Nirari III (B. C. 783), to the year 745 when Pul or Tiglath-pileser III seized the throne.

Israel was left to enjoy an epoch of peace. The prizes of war and the profits of commerce brought riches and ease. But while an age of outward splendor, prosperity brought with it a train of evils which eventually caused a national collapse. The soldiers returning home with habits demoralized by their life in camp were unfit for the quiet life of home. The government, held together by the strong hand of Jeroboam, was in reality tottering to decay. The princes were but dissipated weaklings—the laws of the land were flagrantly violated (*Amos 2:8*), and the courts of justice became courts of shame—justice going to the highest bidder. (*Amos 5:7-12*).

The rich had their Summer and Winter palaces (*Amos 3:15*), furnished with all the splendor of royalty (*Amos 3:15; 5:11; 6:4*). Here amid the soft strains of music, the delicate perfumes, and the coarsest sensuality, they carried on their unseemly debauches. (*Amos 6:4-6*). The great public festivals were marked by disgraceful orgies. (*Hos. 7:5*). Nor were the women of the land more moral or refined. (*Amos 4:1*). Along with sensuality there came the passion for wealth—the rich became the terrible task-masters of their age. The judges and courts were controlled by them; where other methods failed, a bribe sufficed to give them their desire. (*Amos 2:6*). So far did they carry their high-handed arrogance that they “sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes.”⁹ False weights were everywhere in use. (*Amos 8:4*). The picture in the so-called upper class becomes all the more repulsive when one recalls that while such arrogant godlessness filled the land, the New Moons and Sabbath festivals were regularly observed—the sacrifices and burnt offerings abounded (*Amos 2:8*), and the temple coffers were faithfully remembered. (*Amos 7:13*).

The conditions among the poor were intolerable. It is interesting how frequently the words *poor* and *needy* recur in the nine short chapters of the book of Amos.¹⁰ Hounded by the rich and denied justice in the courts, the lot of the poor was but little bet-

⁹ The significance of this statement of the prophet is not that at first the judges sold the innocent as slaves for silver, and later became so depraved that they would sell a righteous for a pair of shoes, but rather, for silver (i. e., a bribe), a judge would betray an innocent party, and for a debt as small as a pair of shoes, would sell a man into slavery.

¹⁰ 2:6-7; 4:1; 5:11; 8:4-6; etc.

ter than slavery. The corruption found in the upper class naturally filtered down through the submerged class. Immorality became so gross that the moral sense of the nation seemed entirely atrophied. Nothing was more repugnant to them than to be censured, or have their attention directed to their sad plight. (*Amos 5:10*).

But where were the prophets? Where were those great defenders of national righteousness in this hour of need?

No field of Old Testament study is more fascinating than that of prophecy. The more closely one studies the forces at work in Israel and Judah and their environment, the more evident is it that, without the prophets the people of Israel would have wandered off into the sins of their day, and have gone down in the general ruin that swallowed up their neighbors. Throughout the Old Testament reference is continually made to various "Schools of Prophets." In endeavoring to form an idea of the general nature and purpose of these schools, we have alas very few definite facts to build on. There are, however, interesting observations which afford a general conception of their character. We first hear of the School of Prophets in the time of Samuel (*1 Sam. 10:5-12*), when we read of a company (*Hebr. hebel*) of them coming down from high places in Gibeah, "with a psaltery, a tabret, a pipe and a harp." Whether they dwelt on the high place and were associated with it, we are not told—the inference is rather that they had come in a body to worship at the high place and were now returning to their quarters. In *1 Sam. 19:18* and *20:1*, we learn of a district in Ramah termed "Naioth," wherein David sought refuge from Saul—we are further told in *1 Sam. 19:20* that over the company of prophets found here, Samuel presided "as one appointed over them." If Ewald's rendering of Naioth, as *schools*, is tenable¹¹ we find here a settlement or seminary of prophets under the leadership of Samuel. Similar companies of prophets are mentioned as located in Bethel (*2 Kings 2:3*), Jerico (*2 Kings 2:5*), and Gilgal (*2 Kings 4:38*). The number of those connected with these associations naturally varied—50 prophets were in Jericho at

¹¹ To this Driver takes exception. See Hastings Dict. Bible, art. on Naioth. Rendered *habitations* in Brown, Driver, Briggs, "Hebr. Eng. Lexicon," but marked *dubious*.

the close of Elijah's career (2 Kings 2:7 & 16), and a short while before 100 are found in Gilgal (2 Kings 4:38). Obadiah is said to have hidden 100 in caves to shield them from the fury of Jezebel. (1 Kings 18:4).

In these prophetic fellowships we find cenobitism, but not celibacy—nor was even cenobitism essential. (Kings 4:1). Among them there were young men (2 Kings 9:4), married men (2 Kings 4:1), as well as men of ripe old age. The prophet, in manner of dress and mode of life, was distinct from the people. Elijah's dress is described as a rough mantel of hair, goat or camel's, with a leather girdle. From Zech. 13:4, and Matt. 3:4, we are led to infer that such was the characteristic dress of the prophets.

The office was not hereditary—selection to it seems to have rested entirely upon a direct call from God. Such is explicitly stated in the case of all the canonical prophets except Daniel, Nahum, Habbakuk and Malachi. The selection of Elisha by Elijah is the only instance on record in which a prophet selected his successor, and in that case it was done in obedience to a direct command of God. (2 Kings 19:16).

These prophetic bands were supported by voluntary contributions. At stated times, such as the New Moons, Sabbath Days, etc., and in times of great distress or need, the people resorted to them.¹² In the northern kingdom the influence and wealth of the prophetic schools was greatly increased, as they served as a substitute for a legitimate sanctuary.¹³

The influence of the prophetic schools on the nation's life and character cannot be overestimated. In the decline of Israel under the vacillating rule of Ahab, prophetic influence went so far as to overthrow the reigning dynasty of Omri. (1 Kings 19:6).

Thus we find the prophetic schools settlements or associations of prophets, presided over by some prophet of note.¹⁴ To consider them schools of learning in which those called to the prophetic office were assigned a definite course of study as a preparation for their subsequent career, does not involve an im-

12 At such times it was the custom to present the prophet with some gift. See 1 Sam. 9:8 and 1 K. 14:3.

13 See Oehler's "O. T. Theology," sec. 174, also 2 K. 4:42.

14 See Marti, "Geschichte d. Israel. Religion (vierte aufl.) S. 121.. Stade, "Bibl. Theol. des Alten Testaments" S. 131.

possible strengthening of the imagination. In fact a consideration of the case may be said to lend a strong probability to this view. Here music was studied as a mode of expressing the religious emotions, as well as a means of rendering one capable of best receiving divine revelations. (1 Sam. 10:5). One cannot but feel, too, that Israel's past, and the noble characters it produced, occupied a most important place in their study and meditation. From these centers, where fellowship kept aglow their zeal for Jehovah, they went forth, singly or in numbers, to proclaim some message or to minister to the spiritual needs of the people. Those connected with these guilds or associations, were known as *Bene nabium* or *Sons of the prophets*.

What Amos meant, therefore, by his declaration at Bethel: "I was no prophet neither was I the son of a prophet," was simply that he was in no way affiliated with any association of prophets.

Protected from severe scrutiny because of the prevalent superstition, and possessed of power and plenty, prophecy became an office rather than a calling. The high ideals of their mission were so forgotten that we find them maintained in companies as royal parasites. (1 Kings 22:6). Priests and prophets reeled in drunkenness and were contaminated with the worst vices of the age.

Hence it is that we find the schools of prophets supplanted as vehicles of divine revelation, and in their stead come those noble characters in whose messages we find the greatest heights of religious truth to be found in any country in pre-Christian times.

THE MAN.

Ten miles south of Jerusalem—five miles south of Bethlehem—perched upon a rocky summit 2700 feet high, was the little Judean town of Tekoa. In the Septuagint we find it mentioned as one of the cities belonging to Judah enumerated at some length in the fifteenth chapter of Joshua—but in the Hebrew text, *in loco*, we find no mention of the name. However, in Chronicles 2:24 and 4:5, Tekoa is mentioned as one of the cities

of the period of the Judges: Ashur, half-brother of Caleb, being its founder. (1 Ch. 2:18-24).

Recalling the incidents recorded in the fourteenth chapter of 2 Chronicles concerning the wise woman of Tekoa—also that it was here that David gathered his company of heroes (2 Ch. 23:26; 1 Ch. 11:28), we are led to believe that Tekoa enjoyed a most enviable distinction. Situated as it was, it always afforded the fugitive a safe retreat. Here David was sheltered from vindictive Saul, and here Simon and Jonathan fled, after the death of Judas Maccabaeus, to escape the Syrian general Bacchides. (Josephus, Ant. 13:1-2 and 1 Mac. 9:33). Rehoboam selected Tekoa as a place of strategie importance in fortifying the land against foreign invasion (2 Ch. 11:6), subsequent rulers seemed to share in this conviction, for in the time of Jeremiah we find this stronghold still preserved as one of the national defenses. (Jer. 6:1).

For some reason Tekoa is not given in the list of places re-peopled by those of the return under Ezra (Ez. 2)—although we find the Tekoites working side by side with the others in restoring the walls of Jerusalem. (Neh. 3:5-27).

Tekoa is surrounded by miles of lifeless waste. Perhaps the most vivid picture we have of the surroundings is that given by George Adam Smith in his epoch-making work on the Historical Geology of the Holy Land.: "The strata were contorted; ridges ran in all directions; distant hills to the north and south looked like gigantic dust heaps, those near we could see to be torn as if by water-spouts. When we were not stepping on detritus, the limestone was blistered and peeling. Often the ground sounded hollow; sometimes rock and sand and rock slipped in large quantities from the tread of the horses; sometimes the living rock was bare and jagged, especially in the frequent gullies, that therefore glowed and beat with heat like furnaces." Far above this rolling waste towered Tekoa. Owing to the impoverished condition of the soil, which rendered it unfit for agricultural purposes, the inhabitants turned their attention to cattle raising, especially sheep raising. As to the size and relative importance of the place there are no data; but one finds it difficult, on the very face of the matter, to suppose Tekoa the source

of all ancient Israelitic life and culture, as does Prof. Cheyne in the *Encyclopedie Biblica*.

The view from Tekoa is one that naturally produces a meditative frame of mind. To the north, just beyond the horizon, was Jerusalem, to the east the Dead Sea, to the west the Mediterranean, but as far as the eye could see there was only the rolling hills. Such are the surroundings amid which we find the home of the prophet Amos.

FAMILY.

The fact that his father's name is not mentioned,¹⁵ and that no reference is made to his family, seems to indicate that Amos was not a member of a distinguished family—though it is possible that the same spirit which made him come out so boldly as a member of no association of prophets, might lead him to come too, “without father and mother”—without any recommendation except the divine message which he bore.

OCCUPATION.

The prophet's occupation was that of a *noked* (or shepherd), a designation occurring in only one other passage of Scripture (2 Kings 3:4), where it is used in connection with the king of Moab. There is no occasion for inferring because of his occupation, Amos was in meagre circumstances—in the Iliad two of Priam's sons are spoken of as *shepherds* of their father's sheep. (Iliad, bk. 11). The sheep belonged to an unusual species of very unseemly creatures, which, though of ugly proportions, were kept for their wool.

We see then in Amos, a herdman or wool-grower, not a mere keeper of sheep, but a shepherd of comfortable means, who, when he desired, could journey off and leave his flock in the care of underlings. (Amos 7:14-15).

In connection with wool-raising, Amos was a “dresser of Sycamores.” The sycamore—not to be confused with the tree known by that name in our country—is closely akin to the fig tree. It develops usually into a tree covering quite an ample space with

¹⁵ Compare with Jer. 1:1; Ez. 1:3; Hos. 1:1; Joel 1:1; etc.

its wide-spreading limbs. The fruit produced is very similar to the fig, though not so palatable. In order to facilitate its ripening, and improve its flavor, the ripening fruit was punctured.¹⁶ Whether Amos was engaged in puncturing the fruit, tending the trees, or collecting the fruit and disposing of it to the trade, it is not possible to determine. The word used in this connection is derived from the Hebr. *balam*, renders any one of the above suggestions possible and all alike plausible. We shall not be far wrong if we regard the prophet as one who owned a grove of sycamore trees in connection with his flock, and who superintended and assisted in their cultivation and in placing the fruit on the market.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT.

Amid such environment one finds many things conducive to the intense convictions, the bold originality, and the striking imagery of the prophetic message. Life here in the desert developed the sterner side of human nature. Away from the distractions and confusion of larger communities, he was left alone with God in a solitude where "undisturbed and uninfluenced from without, the mind follows every train of thought to the end, and examines and exhausts every feeling to its finest shades. The senses have but little to attract them, consequently the mind seeks refuge by turning its attention inward and upward." Schooled in the solemn stillness of the wilderness, "in the lonely vastness" of the desert, amid its dangers and its questions, Amos' soul was a fit dwelling place for the profounder problems of human existence.¹⁷ But we mistake the facts in the case, if we picture the prophet as living the life of a recluse, out of all personal touch with the world. A very essential part of his occupation was the placing of his wares upon the market—this would lead him to journey, twice a year at least, to the various commercial centers.¹⁸ Such a mission would take him not only to the cities of Judah, but to the cities of the northern

16 See art. in Hastings' Dict. of Bible on Sycamore, by G. E. Post.

17 Compare Moses, David, Elijah, Paul, etc.

18 So Guthe, "Vorlesungen über Amos" winter semester, 1904-1905. Also Geo. Adam Smith, "Minor Prophets" vol. 1, p. 79.

kingdom, as well—perhaps, even as far as Damascus. At such times his mind trained to observe, would naturally be confronted with the religious decadence everywhere so evident. The needs of his age were burnt into his very soul; then in the quietness of his desert home these problems were explored—thus the *external call* was preparing the way for a full appreciation of the *internal call*. The intellectual grasp of Amos will always remain a puzzle, even though we remember that “Among the Hebrews as in the Arabian desert, knowledge and oratory were not affairs of professional education, or dependent for their cultivation on wealth or social status. The sum of book learning was very small—shrewd observation, a memory retentive of traditional lore, and the faculty of original reflection took the place of laborious study as the ground of acknowledged intellectual pre-eminence.”¹⁹

SCENE OF PREACHING.

No city in the northern kingdom possessed more hallowed memories than Bethel. It was in existence when Abraham came up from his Chaldean home in Ur to dwell in the land of Canaan. (Gen. 12:8). After his sojourn in Egypt, during the famine that swept over Palestine, we find Abraham pitching his tent in the vicinity of Bethel. (Gen. 13:3). But it was with the life of Jacob that Bethel was most intimately associated—it was here that the weary fugitive rested his head upon a pillow of stones and saw visions of Jehovah. Henceforth it became more and more a place regarded as peculiarly sacred. “It was the haunt of angels”—it was a spot to which Jehovah was strangely near and where he from time to time revealed his presence.²⁰ During the period of the Judges we find Bethel an important center of the religious life of the northern tribes—well defined roads or highways led to it from the various places of importance. (Judges 21:19). It was to Bethel that the people came to offer their sacrifices and to consult the will of God. (Judges 20:18 and 21:2). In the period of the United Kingdom Bethel was overshadowed in the religious life of the nation by Jerusalem.

19 W. Robertson Smith, “Prophets of Israel,” p. 126.

20 Benzinger—“Archeologie” S. 313.

David's plan in erecting a *national* sanctuary would naturally tend to make his capitol the religious, as well as political, center of his realm. In an age when religion was largely supplanted, or at least confused with its degenerate half-brother, superstition, such a plan would do much to bridge the chasm which always existed between the northern and southern tribes. Under Solomon the plan was objectively realized, though as far as gaining the affections of the northern tribes is concerned, the venture did not prove a success. The centers of religious life existed as before. With the insurrection under Jeroboam I, there naturally followed the setting up of Bethel and Dan in the affections of the people as a counterpart of, and a substitute for, Jerusalem. As a matter of statesmanship, the royal house must not only secure a decisive break *politically*, but *religiously* as well, in order to give permanence to the northern realm. Hence it was that Bethel became the recipient of royal favors and perquisites, it was known as the royal sanctuary, possessed great wealth and luxury, and maintained a school of prophets. (2 Kings 2:3). The members attached to such religious centers fell naturally under the classification of *officers of the crown*, and as such they shared in the fate (Schicksal) of the reigning house.²¹ (2 Kings 10:11). The king possessed the unquestioned right of elevating or deposing from the priesthood.²² In the light of such conditions it becomes very obvious why priests and prophets became such inefficient ministers to the real spiritual needs of the people.

The cup of Israel's iniquity was full—the lions of Nineveh were crouching to spring—ruin was gathering—and still Israel was blind. The people had gathered to worship and feast in Bethel—the royalty was there—the princes and the rulers were there—the rich and the judges whom their bribes had bought, were there. Probably the poor, too, had gathered to enjoy so great an event. Amid their festivities came this strange shepherd of Tekoa, not fawning for royal favor, not lulling them into a death sleep with false hopes, but freely and fearlessly applying the lash of justice upon the backs of rich and poor, great and small. Not even the king was spared! Opposition was soon

21 Benzinger's "Archeologie" S. 332.

22 See Benzinger as above, S. 349; based upon 1 K. 12:31 and 1 K. 13:33.

aroused, an open break occurred between the prophet and one of the priests attached to the royal sanctuary, but after the heated argument, Amos was allowed to continue his message, after which he returned to his desert home. "On reaching home he probably put into writing the substance of his deliverances, and the roll thus written is the earliest book of prophecy that has come down to us."²³

Of the subsequent life of Amos nothing is known. Christian tradition of about the sixth century classifies him among the martyrs: supposing him to have been murdered by a son of Amaziah.

THE MESSAGE.

Chapter I, verse 1, is taken up with an exhaustive superscription which enables us to determine the precise age in which he prophesied.

In verse 2, one is reminded of the vision of the majesty of God given in the 6th chapter of Isaiah. *Jehovah will roar as a lion from Zion, he will thunder forth his voice from Jerusalem*—so great are the power and majesty of Jehovah that at this expression of his anger, *the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn. Carmel*—which has stood for ages long, which rears its proud head over all other hills of the land—Carmel, of all our land the most beautiful and fertile,²⁴ even Carmel—*shall droop and wither, when Jehovah's anger breaks over us.*

In the stirring words of this second verse we find in unsurpassed rhythm, the text or theme to be developed in the book.

GOD'S JUDGMENT ON THE SURROUNDING NATIONS.

Amos was sent to preach to Israel, and he approaches his task with consummate skill. He begins by predicting the downfall of Israel's mortal enemies. This course we have reason to believe he adopted for a two-fold purpose. (1) To gain the attention, confidence and good-will of his hearers. (2) To make his argument against Israel all the more irresistible. These na-

²³ See A. B. Davidson in Hastings D. B. vol. 1, p. 86.

²⁴ Conder's "Handbook," p. 209.

tions, not having prophets to remind them of their duty to God were to be judged because of their sins—what then would be Israel's punishment! The oft recurring, "For three transgressions—and for four," is not used with reference to special transgressions but rather to show that the cup of their iniquity was filled to the brim.

Because of the inhuman cruelties which Damascus inflicted upon Gilead, i. e., the territory lying east of the Jordan (Deut. 3:13; Josh. 13:11 & 31; Nu. 32:29 & 39, etc.), Jehovah will send down upon them a consuming fire.²⁵ They shall be carried away to Kir.²⁶

In the case of Syria its metropolis, Damascus, was selected; so now in pronouncing the ruin of Philistia, Gaza,²⁷ its chief city, was chosen. Here, too, there was a great wrong which stood out prominently in their history. They had carried away captive entire populations, sparing neither age nor sex,²⁸ "to deliver them over to Edom," who, perhaps, as the international slave traders, resold them.

Nor would luxury-loving Tyre²⁹ escape the coming catastrophe—the Phoenicians had closed their hearts to pity, had sold entire communities into slavery and had violated their covenants.³⁰

25 For the Assyrian Account of the fulfillment of this prophecy see note on page 31, Band 2, of *Keilin-Schriftliche Bibliothek*.

26 Kir, according to Amos 9:5, was the original home of the Syrians, and according to 2 Kings 16:9, was the place to which they were deported by Tiglath-pileser III.

27 In 710 B. C. Gaza formed a coalition with Sabako, king of Egypt—it was captured by Sargon, king of Assyria, and Hanno, king of Gaza, was brought a prisoner to Assyria. See the Cylinder Inscription of Sargon—Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, p. 43.

28 This is very probably the significance of Amos 1:6 b. Also rendered by Ewald, Welhausen, Nowack, Marti and Harper.

29 Tyre paid tribute to Assyria for centuries, under Assurnazirpal, Shalmaneser II, Tiglath-pileser III, and others. In 726 B. C. we find Shalmaneser IV unsuccessfully attacking Tyre by sea. Sennacherib's campaign in 701 B. C. against Tyre was by no means decisive. Tyre eventually fell in 684 A. D. before the aggressive Assurbanipal. See Annals of Assurbanipal in Keilinschriftliche Bibl. Band II.

30 A similar covenant referred to in 1 Kings 5:12.

Edom's³¹ inhumanity has at last run its course—soon would they reap as they had sown.

In the prophetic arrangement of the nations there is a suggestion of the climatic order. Not so much from the standpoint of guilt, for they seemed all alike steeped in the revolting cruelties of their age—but rather, with reference to the animosity with which Israel regarded them. Hence Ammon and Moab³² are next selected. Both were closely akin to the Hebrews and between them there always existed the bitterest hatred. Ju. 3:12-14; 10:7-18; 1 Sam. 11; 2 Sam. 10:3; 2 Chron. 20).

In their wars, in order to reduce the strength of their enemies, the Ammonites had indulged in a form of cruelty not uncommon in the Orient, that of slaying mothers with their unborn children. (2 Kings 8:12). Because of their inhumanity revealed in this crowning brutality—ruin shall overtake them; even the city of their pride, Rabbah, shall not escape, and their king and the nobility shall wear their lives away in captivity. Moab shall fare no better—flames shall devour the palaces of Kerioth; and Moab shall be overthrown amid the shouting and rejoicing of its enemies.

Between Israel and Judah there slumbered a feeling of rivalry which not infrequently brought them into open hostility. (1 Kings 15:16; 2 Kings 14:8-15, 16:5). Hence it was against Judah³³ that the prophet next lifted his voice.

31 We find "Kausmelech of Edom" paying tribute to Tiglath-pileser in 736 B. C. In 711 B. C. Edom united in the widespread coalition of the various Syrian nations with Egypt and Merodachbalodon of Babylon against Sargon, king of Assyria. The league was overthrown and Edom, along with the rest, paid tribute to Sargon. Again in 701 B. C. Edom united in an unsuccessful revolt headed by Hezekiah of Judah.

32 Ammon and Moab were subjugated along with the other people of West Asia. We find them both paying tribute to Assyria during the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.

33 In 732 B. C. Judah was tributary to Assyria. (Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, Keilins. B. Band 2, p. 21.) In 711 B. C. Hezekiah of Judah united in an unsuccessful revolt against Sargon. Again in 701 B. C. Hezekiah refused to remain subject to Assyria and Sennacherib with his victorious troops were soon in front of the walls of Jerusalem. The Egyptian army sent to rescue Jerusalem was totally overthrown. In Sennacherib's inscription we read as follows: "And I besieged 46 walled cities of Hezekiah of Judah who had not surrendered himself to any yoke: the strongholds and small towns in this vicinity, without number....I plundered, 200,150 people, young and old, male and female—horses, beasts of burden, asses, camels, cattle and

Up to this point, chapter II, verse 6, we have but the introduction to that which follows. Now begins the prophet's scathing arraignment of the conditions, religious and social, as they existed in Israel.

Israel's cup of iniquity, too, was running over. "*They have sold the righteous* (or, the cause of the righteous) *for silver, and the needy for* (a debt as small as) *a pair of shoes; they pant after the dust of the earth on the heads of the poor*, i. e., they long to see the dust of the earth scattered upon the heads of the poor, they delight in seeing the misery of the poor thus indicated.³⁴ *They turn aside the way of the humble* (deprive them of their rights). *A man and his father go in to the same young woman, and so profane my name.*³⁵ *They lay themselves down beside every altar upon clothes taken in pledge*—such garments according to Ex. 22:26, were to be returned at sun-down. *They drink the wine of such as have been fined*, i. e., wine purchased with fines unjustly imposed—in the house of their God."

How painful was the contrast between Israel's condition and the blessing which they had enjoyed. God had brought them up from Egypt, had enabled them to overthrow enemies far stronger than themselves, and had sent messengers to remind them of their duty and trust. Now the day of probation and opportunity was over and the day of judgment was dawning in which the State would totter into ruins and all its inhabitants, from

small cattle, without number, I caused to be taken from them and reckoned them as booty....He himself I shut up like a caged bird in his royal city... The fear of the splendor of my majesty overthrew Hezekiah, and Uriel and his brave warriors, whom he had summoned for the defense of his capitol, laid down their arms." Sennacherib's "Prism Inscription" in Kellina. Bibl. Band II. p. 94. We see here no direct statement that Sennacherib captured the city—the language seems evasive. Hence it throws interesting light upon 2 Kings 19:2, Chron 32, and Isa. 37 in which we learn of the miracle wrought to save Jerusalem from the hands of the Assyrians. The brilliant reign of Josiah was brought to an end by the fall of the king in the battle against Necho at Megiddo, B. C. 608. From 608 to 605 B. C. Judah was a vassal of Egypt. After the battle of Carchemish the tribute was paid to Assyria instead of Egypt. In 597 B. C. Nebuchadnezar captured Jerusalem—in 588 B. C. Zedekiah refused to meet the Babylonian demand for tribute, and two years later Nebuchadnezar again captured and plundered the city and destroyed the temple.

³⁴ So rendered by Orelli, "Kleine Propheten," also Geo. Adam Smith, in "The Minor Prophets."

³⁵ Probably a temple prostitute connected with Astarte worship. See Ewald, "Die Propheten des alten Bundes." Nowack, "Die Kleinen Propheten" and others.

the least to the greatest would be made to taste the curse of Israel's apostasy.

"I will make you groan in your places as the threshing wagon, filled with sheaves, makes the floor groan."³⁶ Flight shall perish from the swift, the strong shall not be able to use his strength; the mighty shall not deliver his life nor shall he stand who handles the bow; he that is swift of foot shall not save himself, neither shall the horseman save his life; the most valiant among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day saith Jehovah."

Strange must all this have sounded to the ease-loving, morally-callous throngs assembled for the feast. Not since the days of the United Kingdom had Israel known such prosperity; the State seemed vigorous and safe. Nor was the coming storm to result in a mere change of dynasties as at the fall of Ahab—now the entire nation was to be crushed. There was to be no respect of persons.

Chapter III.—In the first two verses there is briefly summed up the cause of the impending judgment. Israel had been chosen for a definite work—the advantages which they had enjoyed, the revelation they had been given—the experiences through which they had passed—all of these things were but the means by which Jehovah had been training and developing them. These blessings were not soft cushions upon which to pillow slumbering consciences—they were not given to induce moral and spiritual lethargy. Their privileges entailed responsibilities.

So grievous was Israel's deflection, that the heathen neighbors are called in as witnesses. Egypt and Ashdod³⁷ are summoned to Samaria—they are by no means weak, and can tolerate much, yet even they would be amazed at the mad extravagance and flagrant injustices of those who worshipped in Samaria.

Therefore, thus saith the Lord Jehovah, "*An enemy shall surround the land; thy strength shall be stripped from thee; and*

³⁶ This rendering suggested by Hoffman in "Die Zeitschrift für Altestantimentliche Wissenschaft," 1883—3,100 best conveys the prophet's meaning.

³⁷ Winckler and Marti and others prefer, according to the *LLX*, *b'ashur* instead of *b'ashdod*—thus the summons would be to Egypt on the one hand, and Assyria, on the other.

thy palaces shall be plundered." So complete will be the ruin that, as the shepherd finds but two legs or a piece of an ear of the sheep that has fallen into the claws of the lion, so shall there be left of Israel, but the miserable remnant.

The altars of Bethel, a favorite religious center and the royal sanctuary (Amos 7:10; 4:4; 5:5; Hos. 4:14, etc), would God visit in his wrath—the horns of the altar shall be struck off³⁸ and shall fall to the ground. And I will smite the winter house and the summer house—the houses of ivory—i. e., whose walls were ornamented with inlaid ivory, an evidence of great luxury (1 Kings 22:39), and many houses shall perish. The coming catastrophe shall transform the entire land into a mass of ruins.

In verses 3-8, we find the prophet pausing to give an account of the call which made him the messenger of Jehovah. The call is given in four vivid strophes.

Does a lion roar in the forest, when there is no prey?

Does a young lion cry out of his den, if he have taken nothing?

Does a bird fall to the ground if there is no snare?

Does a snare fly up from the ground without taking anything?

Does a trumpet sound³⁹ in the city, and the people not tremble?

Does misfortune befall a city, and Jehovah not have caused it?

Leading up to the strophe which serves as the climax there is the conviction expressed that "the Lord will do nothing (as a punishment) except he reveal his secret to his servants the prophets." Now this has been the case:

"The lion hath roared, who will not fear?

The Lord Jehovah has spoken, who can but prophesy?"

Chapter 4.—In the first three verses we have the judgment

³⁸ An essential part of every altar were the four horns—one at each corner. Their precise significance is not altogether clear—perhaps they were symbols of divine power, which would account for the idea of refuge attached to them. (1 K. 1:50, etc.) This seems more plausible than the idea suggested by Oehler. "O. T. Theo. p. 255 and 256," that the horns were the highest points of the altar and hence the parts nearest heaven. The altar from which the horns had been broken, was a desecrated altar. Stade, "Biblische Theologie d. Alten Testaments," S. 118, Marti, "Geschichte d. Israelitische Religion," S. 35.

³⁹ A warning that danger is near. Ez. 33:3; Jer. 6:1.

pronounced on the depraved womanhood of Israel. They, like the kine of Bashan,⁴⁰ have no higher purpose in life than to eat and drink. In their craving for debauchery and prodigality they urged on their husbands in their oppression of the needy, in order to provide for their extravagances. Nor will Jehovah overlook or fail to bring upon their heads the curse of their sin. No! "The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by his holiness, that days shall come upon you when you will be taken away with hooks, even the last of you with fish hooks."⁴¹

And you shall go out through the breaches (made by the enemies as they burst through the walls), every one straight before her, and ye shall be cast toward Harmon, saith Jehovah."

Go to your holy places Bethel and Gilgal and cover up your godlessness with ritualistic righteousness, for so you delight to do.

Verses 6-11. Warnings.—God's judgment is not sudden in its coming—harbingers have fore-tokened the impending catastrophe. Famine, drought, pestilence, and war has God sent to stir Israel out of its lethargy. But it would not listen! The period of privilege was over; the time for rendering an account had come.

Verses 12-13.—Therefore, "*Prepare to meet thy God O Israel.*" Who is this God? *Behold he is the fashioner of the mountains and the creator of the winds. He reveals unto man his thoughts; he maketh the dawn and darkness and walketh upon the high places of the earth.*"

Chapter V.—Lamentation over Israel, v. 1-3 and 16-20.—So sure is the prophet of the truth of his predictions that he views them as already fulfilled. "*The virgin of Israel has fallen, she shall rise no more; she lies forsaken upon her own floor, and there is none to raise her up.*" So crushing shall be the blow that the city⁴² which went forth a thousand, i. e., that sends

⁴⁰ District east of Jordan famous for its oak forests (Jer. 2:18) and fat-ted cattle.

⁴¹ As captives of course—led like cattle with rings in their noses. So Geo. Adam Smith, "Minor Prophets," Karl Marti, "Dodeka Propheten."

⁴² Cities had supplanted families and tribes as the unit of military enrollment. The army was divided into divisions of a thousand; a hundred and fifty—each having its proper officer. I. Benzinger, "Hebräische Archologie," Zweite aufl. S. 299.

forth a thousand warriors to battle, shall have but one hundred left: the city that sends out its hundred shall have but ten to return. *The day of the Lord!* Why does Israel turn longing eyes toward it? To them it shall be a day of "*darkness not of light.*" "*Wailing shall be in all of thy broad ways, and they shall say in all the streets, alas! alas! and they shall call the husbandman to mourning and such as are skillful in lamentation to wailing. In all the vineyards shall there be wailing for I will pass through the midst of thee, saith Jehovah.*" Nor will it be possible for any to escape. For it will be "*as if a man did flee from a lion and a bear met him; or went into the house and leaned his hand against the wall and a serpent bit him.*"

It is in this chapter that Amos most bitterly denounces the merely ritualistic in religion. With this denunciation he unites an appeal for national reformation which, in fervor and eloquence, is unsurpassed in the entire Old Testament.

Israel had allowed itself to become so engrossed in the externals of religion that in their blindness they "wist not that Jehovah had departed from them." As the form of the mountain is reflected on the surface of the lake at its foot, so how frequently in the vivid pictures of the heroic man of Tekoa do we find reflected the beautiful and sublime of a shepherd's life!

"*Ye who turn justice to wormwood and cast down righteousness to the earth, seek him who maketh the Pleides and Orion, who changes darkness into morning, and darkens the day into night; who calleth the waters of the sea and poureth them upon the face of the earth, Jehovah is his name: who causeth destruction to burst upon the strong, and ruin upon the stronghold.*" Nor did the torpid hearts of Israel care to be told the truth. "*Him who reproves (injustice) at the gate⁴³ they hate, and him who speaketh honestly they abhor.*" Jehovah has seen it all. Inasmuch as they have trampled upon the poor, extorted exorbitant grain taxes, and have covered up their injustices in the court with bribes—the houses of hewn stone, and the pleasant vineyards which such measures had brought them, they should never be permitted to enjoy. There was but one way of escape open to them, it was to "*Hate the evil, love the good, and estab-*

⁴³ Where the people met for judgment and the conduct of legal, or other public business. Deut. 22:15; Ruth 4:1, etc.; 1 K. 22:10.

lish justice in the gate"—only thus is Jehovah's favor to be won.

You trust in your ceremonial and ritualistic worship—these things, divorced, as they are, from a righteous life, are stench in the nostrils of the Almighty. "*I hate, I loathe your feasts, I find no delight in your festivals. Yea, though ye offer me burnt offerings, and meal offerings, I will not accept them, neither will I regard the fatlings of your peace offerings. Take away from me the noise of your songs, and I will not hear the music of your lyres. But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as an overflowing stream.*"

How was it of old? "*Was it (merely) sacrifices and offerings that ye brought me in the wilderness during the 40 years?*"⁴⁴ *But now do ye carry about the tabernacle of your king, the shrine of your images and the star of your god, which you made for yourselves.*"⁴⁵

"Therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus saith Jehovah whose name is God of hosts."

Chapter VI.—The sixth chapter furnishes us with something of a further development of the fifth chapter. It is an unfolding of the theme—Woe to those who dream away the days and are indifferent to the impending danger. Vengeance is upon them.

"Woe to them that are at ease in Zion—to them that are secure in the mountain of Samaria, the notable men of the chief of the nations, i. e., the elite, those who stood at the head of the nation—to whom the house of Israel came." "*Pass ye unto Calneh*—to be identified probably with Kullanhu which is situated six miles from Arpad⁴⁶—*and see; and from thence go ye to Hamath the great*—a flourishing city on the Orontes; *then go down to Gath of the Philistines*—the one of the five great Philistine cities which lay nearest the territory of Israel; *are they better than these kingdoms? or is their border greater than thine?*"⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Sacrifices indeed were brought; but with them was the homage of the heart. Marti, *Dodeka Propheten*. Geo. Adam Smith, "Minor Prophets."

⁴⁵ The reference is naturally to the degraded forms of religious life which had supplanted earlier and purer forms.

⁴⁶ So Prof. Delitzsch, "Wo Log Das Paradies." Hastings D. B. vol. I, p. 344.

⁴⁷ This passage has been variously interpreted. Schrader, Wellhausen,

"Ye that put far away the evil day and cause the seat of violence to come near; that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, that eat the lambs from the flock and the calves from the stall—they live upon the very best of the land—that hum⁴⁸ to the sound of the viol: that invent for themselves instruments of music like David, that drink wine in bowls and anoint themselves with the choicest oils; but they are not grieved because of the affliction of Joseph." Their minds are so taken up with luxury and debauchery that they fail to see the terrible decadence of Israel. Now shall they go into captivity at the very head of the captives—in the very fore-front of the long line of captives shall go these enervated weaklings whose luxury and indifference to the responsibility of leadership, had done so much to make the apostasy of Israel so fatal. *"The revelry of the banqueters shall cease. The Lord Jehovah hath sworn by himself, saith Jehovah the God of hosts; I abhor the pride of Jacob, and his palaces I hate; therefore will I deliver up the city and all that is within.* So terrible is the day that is nigh that *"It shall come to pass, if there be ten men in one house, that they shall die. And when a man's uncle—his nearer relatives being dead—shall take him up, even he who burns him,⁴⁹ to bring the bones out of the house, and shall say unto him that is the innermost parts of the house—a lone survivor who in terror has hid himself—Is there any with thee? And he*

Newack and Harper regard the passage as a threat—conveying the sense, "If these cities, whose greatness even surpassed Israel's are now in ruins, Israel may likewise perish." They are cited thus as examples of "fallen greatness." Such an interpretation is out of question unless we regard the verses as a gloss or later interpretation. For Calneh did not fall until 711 B. C. when it was conquered by Sargon, who captured Hamath in 720 B. C., and Gath in 711 B. C. (Rogers' "Hist. of Babylonia and Assyria," vol. II.) The significance is rather to be found in regarding the verses as an appeal to awaken a sense of their past ingratitude. "Behold these other cities, Calneh, Gath, and Hamath, not one is more flourishing than you; thus has Jehovah dealt with you—how have you received his blessings?" So rendered by Ewald, Orelli and W. Robt. Smith.

48 The verb *Parat* is found only here, and its exact meaning is uncertain. See Brown, Briggs, Driver, Hebrew English Lexicon.

49 Cremation was rare in Israel—the case of Saul and his sons being cremated by the men of Jabesh Gilead (1 Sam. 31:12) is a prominent exception. Even in cases where the number of the dead was great, burial was the practice (Ez. 39:11-16). For this reason it is generally accepted that the burner here spoken of was one who burnt spices in honor of the dead. 2 Ch. 16:14 and 2 Ch. 21:19, make it very probable that such a view is correct.

shall answer "None;" then shall he say, "Hush" for we dare not make mention of the name of Jehovah.⁵⁰ For behold Jehovah commandeth, and the great house shall be smitten into fragments and the small house into breaches, i. e., the palaces of the rich and the hovels of the poor shall alike go down into ruins!

"Do horses run upon the rock? Does one plow the sea with oxen, that ye have turned justice into gall and the fruit of righteousness into wormwood?" There is a natural order of things in life, but your manner of life has been as irrational as if one were to run his horses upon the rocks or try to plow up the sea with oxen. *"Ye who rejoice in a thing that is nothing, that say, "Have we not taken unto ourselves horns by our own strength? Behold I will raise up against you a nation O house of Israel, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts, and they shall afflict you from the entrance to Hamath—which was the northern limit of Israel's territory about the middle of the eighth century B. C. (2 Kings 14:25)—unto the stream of Arabah.⁵¹*

Chapter VII.—Up to this point the prophet has hurled himself with all of the strength of his unique personality against what he knew to be the great undermining sins of Israel. From first one and then another point of view he assails the godlessness of his age. In the first ten verses of the chapter he tactfully mingles warning and appeal, in the account of his three visions.

(A) THE VISION OF LOCUSTS.

Thus the Lord Jehovah showed me; and, behold he formed locusts in the beginning of the shooting up of the latter growth; and lo, it was after the king's mowing.⁵² And it came to pass,

⁵⁰ Driver's rendering is especially apt. "Do not mention his name and thus make him aware of your presence," lest he strike again to make the crushing complete.

⁵¹ In 2 K. 14:25 we read that Jeroboam "restored the border of Israel from the entrance of Hamath unto the sea of Arabah," i. e., the Dead Sea. The stream of Arabah most likely refers to a stream flowing into the northern end of the Dead Sea: which would mean that at this time the territory of Israel extended as far as the Dead Sea. So regarded by Nowack, Driver, Marti and Geo. Adam Smith.

⁵² The first growth was gathered for taxes and the support of the royalty. It is very probable that taxation was reduced to a system by Solomon. (Benzinger's Hebräische Archæologie, p. 257). Hence the coming of the locusts just as the aftergrowth was shooting forth was the most inopportune and disastrous of all times as far as the people were concerned. It meant want and famine in the land.

that as they were making an end of devouring the grass of the land, I said, "O Lord Jehovah, forgive I pray thee: how shall Jacob stand, for he is small."⁵³ Jehovah repented concerning this: "It shall not be," saith Jehovah.

(B) THE VISION OF DESTROYING FIRE.

Thus the Lord Jehovah showed me: and behold the Lord Jehovah called to contend by fire—fire was brought in as a punishment upon the land—and it devoured the great deep. The reference here is very evidently not to the ocean, but rather to the great deep from which the wells, springs and all streams received their supply. (Ex. 20:4). All of the sources of water supply were dried up, and as the fire swept on it would have eaten up the land. Again at the prayer of the prophet, Jehovah withdrew the impending ruin.

That these passages refer to any definite clouds which threatened Israel's life is improbable. We are to find emphasized three important facts:

(1) God has not been blind to the ungodliness and grossness of Israel.

(2) God has inflicted them with the severest punishments, as severe even as locusts and drought—but even these did not open their eyes.

(3) God is merciful—slow to anger and ever ready to forgive. The prayer of a single prophet was able to save a nation.

Then follows a third vision:

(C) THE VISION OF THE PLUMB-LINE.

Thus he showed me; and behold the Lord stood beside a wall made by a plumb-line; with a plumb-line in his hand. And Jehovah said unto me, "What seest thou Amos?" And I said, "A plumb-line." Then said the Lord, "Behold I will set a plumb-

53 Amos pictures himself here as an intermediary pleading with God in behalf of his people—as Abraham pleading for Sodom. (Gen. 18:22, etc). As Moses in battle with Amalekites. (Ex. 17:8). As Samuel for Israel at Mizpah (1 Sam. 7) or as Jeremiah praying that God will be merciful to Israel (Jer. 14:7-10).

line in the midst of my people Israel⁵⁴ I will not again pass by them any more"—the high places of Isaac shall be desolate and the sanctuaries of Israel shall be laid waste; and I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword." Jehovah has come to test Israel and she is found wanting. The land shall be devastated—the sanctuaries shall be despoiled, and, in this general collapse of the nation, the reigning house shall be overthrown.

Such a sweeping prophesy was not allowed to pass unchallenged. Some have supposed that the prophet was interrupted just at this point because of the nature of his utterance in the ninth verse—which was regarded as treason against the king. It is probably the case that in the throng gathered to listen to the prophetic message were some of the royal spies who mingled in the crowd on such occasions to keep the officials posted on any developments which would be against the interests of the king.⁵⁵ Such individuals upon hearing the scathing utterances and seeing their effect upon the popular mind, would not fail to report to the king's officials. Amaziah the priest of Bethel is delegated as the king's representative to order the offender back to his home in Judah.

The charge results in an open clash between the royal delegate and the fearless son of the desert, whose dire predictions had probably cast a spell of sympathy over those who knew the justice of his cause. Matters had gone too far to openly seize him on the charge of treason, so a personal rebuke was resorted to. "*O thou seer, go flee thou away into the land of Judah and there eat thy bread, and prophesy there: but prophesy not again in Bethel, for it is the king's sanctuary, and it is a royal house.*" Opposition stirred the mountain lion into rage: "*I was no prophet, neither was I one of the sons of the prophets.*"...I was neither by profession a prophet, nor was I a member of any school of prophets—but *I was a herdman and a dresser of sycamore trees; and Jehovah took me from following the flock, and Jehovah said unto me, "Go prophesy unto my people Israel."*"

Now therefore hear thou the word of Jehovah: "*Thou sayest,*

54 The builder has come to test the structure—if it does not stand the test it will be destroyed.

55 See Jeremiah, Chapt. 36 for a similar case.

prophecy not against Israel and drop not thy words against the house of Isaac;" therefore thus saith Jehovah, "Thy wife shall be a harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword, and thy land shall be divided by line;⁵⁶ and thou thyself shall die in a land that is unclean,⁵⁷ and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of the land."⁵⁸

Chapter VIII.—One is surprised at the freedom of speech allowed in Israel during the reign of Jeroboam II, (during the age of Jeremiah, c. 625 B. C. is was very different. Jer. 26 and 36:5). Even after defying the royal representative Amos is apparently permitted to continue his message.

(D) THE VISION OF THE SUMMER FRUIT.

Thus the Lord showed me: and behold a basket of summer fruit.⁵⁹ And he said, "Amos, what seest thou? And I said, "A basket of summer fruit." Then saith Jehovah unto me, "The end has come upon my people Israel; I will not again pass them by any more; the songs of the palace shall be wailings in that day," saith the Lord Jehovah; "the dead bodies shall be many; and in every place shall they carry them forth in silence."

Then follows the oft recurring indictment made against Israel. Sad is the future of those whose insatiate greed drives them to oppress the needy—to use false measures and to sell dishonest wares—those who could scarcely control themselves during the "New Moon," and other religious festivals—so eager were they

56 Reference is here made to the policy of the Assyrian kings after Tiglath-pileser III, of colonizing conquered territory with subjects, from a remote section of the kingdom, or of assured loyalty. The line here spoken of is naturally the measuring line.

57 All foreign lands were unclean, because they were not seats of Jehovah's presence.

58 When one reviews the hopes most fondly cherished by the ancient Hebrew, a curse more terrible than this is inconceivable. The fulfilment of the prophecy is recorded in the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III. "The hand of Beth-Omri (Samaria)..... The entire population together with their possessions I led away to Assyria. Pekah, their king, I killed. I placed Hoshea over them. 10 talents of gold (?), 1000 talents of silver (?), together with their....I took from them; to the land of Assyria I brought them." See Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, Band 2, S. 33.

59 The basket was filled with fruits that failed to mature earlier in the season when the choicest fruit was gathered—the fruits were not only inferior, but they showed that the end of the season had come. They suggested in this connection that the autumn of Israel's national life had come.

to carry on their heartless work.⁶⁰ Jehovah hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, "Surely I will not forget any of their works."

In the days of prosperity Israel had adopted the policy of disregarding and killing the prophets--it is in the result of this practice that they are to taste the climax of bitterness! In the day of their direst need there would be no prophets left in their midst to cheer them with the thought of their origin, mission and destiny. When the cataclysm swept every thing before it, and at last they opened their eyes to the logical end of their manner of living, they would find, to their sorrow, that, because of their persistent refusal to obey, Jehovah had sent "*a famine in the land. Not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of Jehovah. And they shall wander from sea to sea,⁶¹ and from the north even unto the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of Jehovah, and shall not find it. In that day shall the fair virgins and the young men*—that is, even the very strongest—*faint for thirst. And they shall swear by the sin of Samaria*—that is, by that which has proven to be the sin of Samaria—and say, "*As thy God, O Dan, liveth;*" and "*As the way of Beersheba liveth*"—thus revealing their idolatrous devotion to them—they shall fall, and never rise again."

Chapter IX.—Chapter IX falls naturally into two sections: (1) V. 1-7, the ruin of Bethel and the complete overthrow of all those who trust in it. (2) V. 7-15, A word of promise.

A VISION OF RUIN.

I saw the Lord standing beside the altar—the altar at Bethel, the center of religion in the northern kingdom—and he said, "Smite the capitals, that the thresholds may shake; yea break them off;⁶² and I will slay the last of them with the sword; not one of them shall flee away; not one shall escape."

In verses 2, 3 and 4, we have an enlargement of the thought given in 5:19. Nowhere can a more striking portrayal of the

60 See Is. 66:23; 2 K. 4:23; and also Benzinger's "Archeologie," p. 388.

61 This may be understood as—from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea; or more generally, as an expression referring to the ends of the earth.

62 Rendering uncertain: above suggested by Harper, *in loco*.

Omnipresence of Jehovah be found in the Old Testament, than we find here in the graphic words of the prophet. *Though, in their efforts to escape, they dig into Sheol, thence shall my hand take them: though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down. And though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel,⁶³ I will track them and take them out from thence: and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command serpent, and it shall bite them. And though they go into captivity before their enemies, thence will I command the sword, and it shall slay them; and I will set my eyes upon them for evil and not for good.*

And who is able to do all this? *The Lord Jehovah of hosts, he that toucheth the land and it melteth, and all that dwell therein shall mourn; and it shall rise up wholly like the river, and shall sink again, like the river of Egypt—he that buildeth his chambers in the heavens, and hath founded his vault upon the earth; he that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth; Jehovah is his name.*"

In verse 7, we have the enlarged conception of Jehovah as the universal God. Then follows the much disputed section⁶⁴ in which denunciation and arraignment give place to a message of hope.

In the storm of vengeance that is gathering God will protect the faithful remnant—and after the sifting is over—*In that day I will raise up the hut of David that is fallen and close up its breaches. And I will raise up its ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all nations which are called by my name, saith Jehovah, that doeth this. Behold the days come saith Jehovah, that the plow-*

63 Because of its inaccessibility, Carmel was a favorite retreat of outlaws.

64 The chief grounds of objection to the Amosian authorship of the section v. 7-15, are: (a) The contrast in which it stands to the total destruction predicted in such passages as 2:14-16, 4:2, 5:18-20. (b) The overthrow of Israel is given as an already accomplished fact. (9:11). (c) There are marked linguistic affinities between this section and the exilic and post-exilic works. It seems, however, in considering these and other objections, that they exaggerate the case. For instance, as to the first objection, Amos clearly emphasizes the fact that there is a righteous remnant which will be spared. See 3:12 and 5:3. As to the second objection, the prophet is so confident of the overthrow of the land that he speaks of it as though it were already accomplished. The linguistic argument is not strong enough to be conclusive. See H. Strack, "Einleitung in d. O. T." 6 aufl. S. 111.

man shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountain shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. And I will bring back the captivity of my people Israel; and they shall rebuild the waste cities and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards and drink the wine thereof, they shall also make gardens and eat the fruit from them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall never again be plucked up from the land which I have given them, saith Jehovah.

Pittsburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

METAPHYSICAL THERAPEUTICS AND THE CHURCH.

BY REV. J. M. CROMER, D.D.

We can understand present conditions only by studying the causes leading up to them. About fifty years ago a new biology was given out to the world. At first many were skeptical, and slow to accept it. Others were friendly because of the light this new science was expected to shed upon the problem of the physical creation. Both scientists and theologians became deeply interested. The hope was entertained that at least new light might be shed upon God's method in creation, especially as far as our earth-planet was concerned.

But Satan, constantly seeking some new role in which to oppose God in the destruction of his chief creature, man, soon put on the scientific robe, and taking up this infant science sought to turn it, as an instrument of invasion, upon the simple biblical account, with the intent of driving God out of the house of his own creation. All sorts of substitutes for the creative fiat grew out of this latest science. Many a hard fought battle was waged between this perverted science and an evangelical faith and many who had hitherto been loyal to revealed truth came to subject it to the test of a partial science only partially understood, and lost their theological mooring. A more discriminate study however, solved the newly raised questions and saved the Church from an apostasy which would have lost sight of the supernatural, and plunged believers into the starless night of atheism.

By and by a new theology came into existence, meeting a fate somewhat similar to that of the new biology. The combined effect was to weaken faith in all that was mysterious, and which could not stand the test of the scientist's crucible, or the theologian's rules of interpretation. Many preachers recast both their message and the form of its presentation, in order to conform as fully as possible to the new terminology of what was now called advanced thought. The whole character of the preaching of

many was changed. The mystery of faith, the mystery of godliness, the mystery of a supernatural revelation, the spiritual and the invisible,—all were lost out of the content of this new gospel. In an attempt to rationalize the gospel, and to strip it of all unnecessary appeals to mere faith, and hence make it supposedly more easily accepted, but at any rate, and which was the chief motive, to conform to the arbitrary edicts issuing from a purely non-religious science, the great body of divine mystery in the Bible, and the large element of mystery in human nature were ignored. Scientific demonstration and philosophical speculation, supplanted the old gospel evolved from "the mystery of godliness," and unavoidably reflected upon the "God made flesh." Thus the common believer, now without anchorage, or mooring, was made subject to every "wind of doctrine."

No matter what the value of higher criticism, the higher critics themselves cannot know how much they have been influenced by a non-religious science, nor how much harm they have done in unsettling the life-long conviction of thousands of Christians, and thus so confusing them that they can no longer distinguish the cry of the "true shepherd" from the clamorings of the "hireling." They do not now know which voice to follow.

We do well to contemplate the type and condition of those minds which for one briefest moment consider the suggestions of "spontaneous generation," and a "fortuitous concourse of atoms" as possible substitutes for that divinely dramatic statement with which the sacred record begins, "In the beginning God created." And though we may not know how, or by what method, we may easily enough allow such a secondary matter as this to lie in the secret counsels of the Almighty, especially when by our crude methods of investigation we come to doubt the fundamental proposition that *God created*.

Little wonder then that the common believer lost his footing of faith in his old-time religion. He also lost his spiritual thermometer, and could not measure those sensations which had fallen below a normal consciousness, and which on that account, were premonitory of spiritual death.

All this, in various degrees, was preparatory for the introduction of the third, last and newest production, namely, *The New Psychology*, thus completing the trinity of tests which have come

upon our faith in this day. This new science, or new statement of an old science, has given rise to various issues and cults which now seem to be at the high-water mark of their influence.

This was naturally and logically the next thing. We might have anticipated it without prophetic vision. The appeal is now metaphysical, the very opposite so far as the believer is concerned from that either of the new biology or of the new theology. See the serpentine wisdom of Satan, and the weak gullibility of poor human nature. Satan "perverts" both the new biology and the new theology into an attack upon faith. Then, when through lack of exercise, the elements of faith become weak, and the spiritual powers are paralyzed, such conditions manifest themselves as to open the way for the metaphysical appeal.

The Church waned and lost its spiritual power under the new methods of preaching caused by the pretentious thought of to-day. The mysterious, which is the very nutrition of the soul, without which it would not and could not be so far as its connection with the physical is concerned, having been eliminated as far as possible, left the spiritual nature in a starving condition. It was a conscious need for something which the churches did not give that made possible all the progress of the various cults of the day. Not that these cults have supplied the need, but that Satan, taking advantage of the prevailing conditions, has also taken up the new psychology and turned it to his base purpose.

Let us remember now that in dealing with this new psychology we are necessarily compelled to deal not only with the scientist and the religionist, but primarily with the witness himself, his experience, and the testimony he bears. Experiences have come to be of such a character, and testimonies accordingly of such an unusual and startling nature, that we are compelled to go back of both and examine the witness himself, inquiring into the balancing of mental and spiritual forces affecting the validity of his testimony.

We are not attempting to assail the new psychology, but as with the new biology and the new theology, to show to what a perverted use it has been turned, and how this perversion has affected the life of the believer. And as the Church, or its pulpit, has loaned its endorsement to the former, at the expense of the most vital elements of our religion, so now is the Church in

danger of being drawn into this new wave. As most artfully utilized by the "arch deceiver," the attempt now is to *supplant the very Holy Ghost himself in his operation through the means of grace upon the minds and hearts of men.*

The whole field of spiritual operation is presumptively covered by this pretentious new form of an old science. At first this new psychology was grossly materialistic. It undertook to designate the particular brain cells affected by the preaching of the gospel, as though there were religious or moral quality in mere gray matter, and also attempted to trace out the special nerve centers thus aroused, by which the brain cells came into communication with the spirit, thus leading to the acceptance or rejection of the gospel message according to the effect thus produced, without the aid of the "convicting" power and agency of the Holy Ghost,—an attempted cerebration of all spiritual operation whether on the part of man, or of God.

In plain opposition to this method of accounting for spiritual results without spiritual operation, is the attempt now made to involve the mind in all mysteries of the subtle and indefinable relation between the physical and the metaphysical, having the aim to establish a system of metaphysical therapeutics, in which the lower, or subliminal consciousness is supposed to be able to assert itself in curative power over the ills of the conscious life in the body.

When we see how in the former case the Holy Ghost has been eliminated from all agency in healing the maladies of the soul, we are prepared to see this same Holy Ghost driven from his influence upon the body. For there is absolutely no religion, nor any need of any, in the healing cults of the day. The chief article or commodity is the gullibility of the individual. And this has been in evidence from the beginning. No modern invention has had anything to do with man's susceptibility to methods calculated to deceive by their very nature.

The bones of a beloved saint have healed thousands of credulous pilgrims. But neither the saint nor his bones had anything to do with the healing. When the saint's bones decayed, and a goat's bones were substituted, the healing went on the same.

Our aim is to account for the progress made by these cults, and for the fact that many of these adherents of this new gospel

are perverts from the true faith. The failure to preach the mysteries of the gospel, the gullibility of human nature, and the "artful devices" of Satan, who now appears as "an angel of light," are at least some of the principal causes.

But before following up our study of the new psychology it would seem necessary to say a few words upon the character of Satan. No army nor contestant ever makes a greater or more fatal mistake than by underestimating or being ignorant of the enemy, his nature and power. Much of our weakness as believers is in the fact that we do not believe that Satan goes up and down the earth "seeking whom he may devour." Many do not believe there is such a being. And many who do not admit his existence come to hardly less fatal conclusions by associating him in their minds, with only the vile, loathsome excesses of the sins of the flesh.

But Satan is purely a spirit, and has his incarnation only in the lives of sinful men. The horrible sins of the flesh have been made possible because Satan alienated man from his God and broke off the holy spiritual relation by disobedience. Satan disobeyed God, rebelled against him and fell. Man disobeyed and fell. The first sin, and the essential sin, was and still is of the mind and heart in rejecting God. All that follows in the life of a fallen spirit associated with a sensuous and fleshly body is but a natural result. The spiritual outlaw runs riot in its operation in and through the sensuous body.

We overlook the more respectable, but none the less damning sins of the intellect and spirit. But these are the initial and causative sins which sever the soul from its God, and which separation lets the flesh drop to the lowest degradation.

Satan is not such a loathsome creature as the vile sins of the flesh would indicate. These are made possible only when man, who is flesh and spirit, breaks away from the laws of the spirit-life and becomes subject to the laws of the flesh. When the divine bond between the soul and its God is broken then man, not having the instinctive faculties of brute-life, falls below the brute.

It is, however, because man is a spiritual being that either God or Satan can operate upon him at all. And it is because there are necessarily opposites in the moral and spiritual, God standing

for good, and Satan for evil, that we as spirits must choose between them.

But who and what is Satan that he has so much power over man? He is called in God's Word an "angel of light," "the ruler of this world," "the god of this world," "the prince of this world," &c., &c. It was not so much that Satan challenged God, but it was much that God accepted the challenge, thus accepting him as a worthy foe. And it has been Satan's mission to this day, "*to pervert the right ways of the Lord.*" We have not understood this *perverting* power. Our Lord rose to the full stature of his divinity when in triumphant victory he commanded Satan hence. This gave Christ kingship over Satan, and which power Satan and all his devils ever afterward recognized. Redemption won in the spirit world by the force of one sharp omnipotent command. It has yet to win on earth and among men by the painful tragedy of the cross prolonged through the ages because God so loved the world that he would have all men saved. There can be no better equipment for the student who would analyze the spirit of the day and understand the struggle of the race for life, than a thorough biblical and metaphysical study of Satanology. The mind and heart are an open market for his wares. Satan rivals God for possession of man, who is the bone of contention between God and Satan. The great battle of the universe for spiritual supremacy is to be fought out between God and Satan in the hearts and minds of men. God has conquered all—where else. Hence it becomes our constant duty to "try the spirits" that would influence us.

The force of the projectile is determined by the impelling power plus the resistance. And thus we must judge of these new movements. There is still left us the recuperating power of resistance.

Why then should Satan have sought to "pervert" the new movements of the day, biology, new theology, and especially the new *psychology?*.. Satan is a past-master in psychology. He is not much on biology, and less on theology, but he is at home in psychology, especially where anything new is attempted in this field. We poor mortals have little hope to be able to make headway in the realm of the metaphysical unless we come fore-armed

with the companionship of Him who led captivity captive and conquered death.

Why should not Satan have suggested the revival in the study of psychology just at this time? No undergraduate was ever better prepared for his final studies than the human mind of to-day has been prepared for the study of psychology—that is, from Satan's standpoint. Satan is only following the logical sequence of events. And what is more, he is now following in the very footsteps of the all-conquering Christ himself. Never in human history has the synagogue of Satan so nearly occupied the very seat of Christ, as in this latest attempt to "pervert" the truth of that science which deals with the phenomena of the flesh-bound spirit in man.

Christ healed. And some would limit the power he used to mere psychological influences. We began to see our miracle-working Lord fade out of all his divine glory and power, as one by one his miracles were attributed to the power of "suggestion," and as he became nothing more than a slight-of-hand performer with the sub-conscious faculties of gullible man, until at last this same Christ *raised the dead!* At last we have come to a miracle where the bungling jugglers with metaphysical temerity themselves stand aghast and only Jesus speaks. And who but the blasphemer will retrace his steps from the empty tomb of Lazarus, going back over the lesser miracles, and attempt to separate the divine from the merely metaphysical? But some have so presumed, and report that at least some of our Lord's miracles will stand the test of being possible only to a divine Lord. Such are curing the congenital lame, blind and the raising of the dead.

Christ healed. The apostles healed. From an early day the Church claimed to heal. But the modern Church did not heal. Was it not a simple "suggestion" starting with Satan himself, that the thing for the Church now to do was to heal? There were healers many and various. The Church was losing to these cults. Satan was in the cults. Why not suggest that the thing to do to hold the deserting followers of Christ was to give them what they wanted—heal them of their ills? Thus the Church might regain her lost hold upon men. And under this glare of possible rehabilitation of the Church's lost power, Satan would take the seat of Christ. And hence many cults have risen and

flourished, and many enterprising ones still in the Church would check the stampede by instituting healing in the churches by opening up schools teaching the art, and by practicing upon the most gullible, but all, both within and without the Church, based upon the most rigid and exacting financial conditions.

And now this bold, bald, unscriptural doctrine is promulgated, which devitalizes the gospel, destroys the uniqueness of Christ's character, minimizes his mission, making his death on the cross ridiculous and meaningless and which trifles with the noble religious element in man,—which constitutes a religion primarily and in its fullest essence spiritual to become primarily for mere physical good, thus shifting the point of emphasis. The whole remedial work of Christ is put in the background. Christ the Saviour is lost in Christ the healer, Christ the teacher is lost in Mrs. Eddy (et al) the interpreter, and Christ the divine Son of God, equal with the Father, is lost in a pantheistic notion which attributes divinity to all men. The feeble attempt at the cultivation of morals, and of character-forming accompanying these cults is the cheapest belief when compared with the life growing out of a regenerated heart and an indwelling Christ. And thus the weak Christian whose way of a simple faith had become toilsome, has been persuaded to "cross over the stile," into "by-meadow path" and has thus landed in "Doubting Castle."

There is just one plain, but not so well understood word which may be used to explain these phenomena, and that word is insanity. Remember that we are now speaking purely metaphysically. Scientists have tried to classify the phenomena of the insane, and some other word might be found to express our idea which would not sound so harsh. But it would be only a substitute for the same thing. Every thing which goes outside the experience of the greater number of the most perfect specimens of the race, in way of mental or spiritual experience must at least be called abnormal. Intellectually all such uncommon experiences are "brain phantasies," and spiritually they are "soul-ecstacies."

Let us follow our study a little farther. Whatever the subjective experience, it must not contradict but co-ordinate with the objective reality. Nor must we lose sight of either in our study of the other. However complex man is he is still only one

being. There may be the conscious self which knocks about in the daytime busied with the affairs of life, and the sub-conscious self which rides nightmares during the night, yet it is the same one acting each time. And no matter how this spirit in its sub-conscious experience may batter its wings against the barred cage of the conscious senses in an effort to reach out beyond them, both must live together until dissolution, and during this tabernacle in the flesh, *they must unify their experiences*. Neither intellect nor heart can deal with contradiction here. Both the superconscious and the sub-conscious are in the borderland of the unconscious.

It is in the realm of these extremes that the attenuated philosophies and cults of the Orient have their origin. But in this realm there can be no sure basis of knowledge for either the metaphysical or the religious. And to our plain, practical occidental mind, such speculation is attended by both danger and evil. We cannot deal with that over which we have neither mental nor sensuous control. We are forced to believe that we see things which are not, and which have in themselves no practical value, and pretended facts are thrust upon us which we have no means of substantiating. Worse than all, human experience is invalidated, which is not only the bulwark of our faith, but of all the relations in life.

We follow the new psychology until we feel that our feet are treading the air and our mind is scaling impossible altitudes where nothing can be determined that will bring the phenomena within sensuous recognition. No color, no shape, no size, no consistency, no language, no picture, type or symbol can reduce the experience to practical proportions. Even self-consciousness loses the force of its meaning because we cannot discriminate it from either the "sub" or the "super-conscious."

William James finds an analogy to the phenomenon of super-consciousness in the effect of anaesthetics. It is also likened to the results of drunkenness. But both are abnormal experiences. And when the experience is had without either of these provoking causes, then we must conclude that the balance of mental and spiritual forces has been broken, and the poise of the being has been unsettled, in either case producing phenomena which can be defined no better than by calling them insanity.

Many will stagger here because they will think at once of the mad-house, bars, cages, and chains and heavily-bolted doors. But this is too gross a conception for this refined or superfine experience. The harmless insane far outnumber the dangerous. Many harmless ones are locked up for fear they will become dangerous, who become dangerous because they are locked up. But many of these belong to that class which is insane upon such high lines as not to suggest physical danger, and who are left to their freedom, but who are unsettling the equilibrium of the thinking and feeling of many.

Is that not a strange order then which confines those who endanger the physical peace, and which honor those as "teachers" and "healers" and "angels of light," and even as interpreters of divine revelation, those neurotics who have lost their balance in the super-conscious realm? Memory has no dependable meaning with such. The end of both "idea" and "perception" has been reached. A mind intoxicated through ecstatic excess is no more reliable in its testimony than a mind intoxicated through the artificial introduction of alcoholic or anaesthetic poison.

The test to-day is not upon faith or revelation, but upon human experience. And since testimony is the human foundation of religious experience, and most vital in the confirmative evidences of Christianity we are bound to protect its validity. And this drives us back of the testimony to the character and quality of the testifier. And when these experiences are so far out of line with the normal mind we must conclude that they are either super-ethereal or sub-tartaran. It is beyond the golden medium of a well-balanced earth-life, and can be accounted for only by Satanic influence which seeks thus to "pervert" the ordinary testimony which the wholly rational mind has always borne to the operation of God's good spirit upon the spirit of man. Christ did not permit Peter's ecstasy on the mount to fuse itself out in building tabernacles, but sought to utilize the power in rational benefit to the distressed world.

Artificially overwrought physical sensation is self-abuse. But so is artificially overwrought spiritual sensation. All experience to be credited as normal must come within the bounds of common everyday consciousness. Granting that the super-consciousness can exempt from a sense of the pain of the body, it is on that

account most dangerous. For conscious pain is God's way of helping us to know that the natural functions upon which health and life depend are not being performed, in order that we may promptly correct the disorder before serious results follow. Is not the life both body and spirit? Do we not have senses full of pleasant and profitable employment? Does not the great Creator intend that these should form a balance of interest in which each should be fully recognized? And can it be any worse for the coarse physical to dominate and crowd out the refined spiritual, than for the super-sensuous to lord it over the physical and destroy its functions? Are not both mentally helpful? And if we will go a little further into this study from a biblical standpoint we will learn how greatly the spiritual is dependent even upon the physical. For without the physical there can be no redemption of the spiritual. There is no redemption for Satan and fallen spirits. And the fallen spirit in man owes its redemption wholly to its combination with the body. For "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." Why then can not the super-sensuous which has its seat in the spiritual bide the time when through redemption it shall have its deliverance, and being untrammeled go on under fairer conditions to the enjoyment of those things impossible to this earth-life, so that all flesh as well as all spirit may at last praise him who both created and redeemed?

Our plea is for the sensuous nature that it may be redeemed from the death caused by the breaking of God's law of life, and finally glorified in a triumphant resurrection. And our claim is that the spirit owes its redemption also to the body. No wonder that such trifling with things which God wisely and purposely veiled in the flesh, for an object entirely overlooked by these ecstasies confounds the mind as to what is and is not real. Surely the dream, the trance, and the imagination are not to take precedence in the realm of the real over the positive and practical experience of the real flesh and sense.

The occidental mind has been intensely practical. It has grown so under the influence of a great undeveloped continent and even hemisphere. Material enterprise has dominated the life. And in no age and in no race has there been such symmetrical development of life and character. The western mind

has been ideal, but within the reach of mundane possibility. It has been spiritual, but within the reach of a rational love to both God and fellow-man. And although we have swung to the danger line of materialism even this is not so overwhelming as the dangers which threaten us from an over-wrought spirit-ism. And no phenomenon has been more amazing and unexpected than that the pendulum of occidentalism should now seem to be surging to the extremes of orientalism.

If our contention is at all patent it must be seen that a great problem is before us. And since the Church is pre-eminently spiritual, the aims of the solution rests with her. She must not yield to the super-sensuous, nor fall into the grossly physical. If she yield to either she must suffer. Metaphysical therapeutics is as much out of her line, as super-sensuous hallucinations. We cannot yield to spiritual intoxication, flying imaginary kites hoping to catch a spark of the divine-infinite with which to sensitize the mortal-finite, and then prostitute this super-natural power to base and purely physical purposes. Earth cannot become either a spiritual utopia or a physical paradise. Both must groan together and await their mutual crowning in more appropriate sphere.

There never was a time in human thinking when the normal, rational consciousness, held in due restraint by practical reason needed more to assert itself both in metaphysical science and revealed religion. The hound hunting his own trail can never catch up with his tail. The super-sensuous must ever evade our earthly grasp. There is a rational reaching out after the more perfect in both body and spirit as exemplified in St. Paul's true philosophy. But the goal lies beyond the reach of the physical. A third-heaven vision may burst upon us but not to slacken our pace in our earthly race, nor to exchange feet for flying wings. The race course is on solid ground and not in evasive air nor vagrant clouds.

Christ made no mistake in putting the emphasis upon the redemption of the spirit, and making the body subservient to this high end. Surely we have no warrant in reversing the order. He healed, but healed no appreciable part of the suffering of that disease-riden land. But he did heal enough to lay the foundation of the confirmative evidence of his deity in the gross

ground of the physical. And under the practical evangel of the gospel the suffering of the body is sanctified to the higher life of the spirit.

Must the Church in this advanced day of spiritual enlightenment go back to the kindergarten methods of healing which were necessary at the beginning? And must the tragedy of human experience be prolonged merely that Satan may rehearse all of the methods in which he has been triumphantly defeated?

Let us reinstate the mysteries of the gospel, but to the end that we may increase our faith in our divine Lord and his complete and adequate redemption. Only when the Holy Ghost shall burn his graces into the human heart can we live the life beautiful. And it is the practical miracle of the gospel that all our sufferings shall be converted into an exceeding glory.

NOTE.—We call attention to George Barton Cutten's late work, "The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity," which every preacher, but especially our students in the seminaries, should read and carefully digest. Of all the books we have read and reviewed on this subject, this is surely best.—Scribner's.

Kansas City, Mo.

ARTICLE V.

THE BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT.

BY REV. WM. WEBER, PH.D.

According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus has called a certain sin a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. That sin alone of all sins shall not be forgiven in eternity. Seriously-minded people have ever again been troubled in their conscience by the question whether they have not become guilty, though unawares, of that unpardonable offense. The attempt, therefore, has been made to give a clear and correct definition of what a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit really is. In doing so, however, men have generally started from dogmatic, not from historical premises.

The result arrived at in this way has been formulated by Plummer (Int. Crit. Comment, Lu. p. 321) as follows: "Constant and consummate opposition to the influence of the Holy Spirit, because of a deliberate preference of darkness to light, renders repentance, and therefore forgiveness, morally impossible. Grace, like bodily food, may be rejected until the power to receive it perishes."

Such explanations may satisfy people who take it for granted that Jesus used the language of our dogmatics. Those who are not so sure that that was the case are obliged to seek reliable information by a different road. They will feel bound to discover first of all which particular, definite action our Lord himself has branded as blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Only by learning that, we shall be enabled to draw safe conclusions as to what would constitute that enormous sin in our own religious life.

That task, moreover, is not beset by exceptional difficulties. All we have to do is to examine minutely and carefully those gospel-passages which treat of the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. These are Mk. 3, 20-30; Mt. 12, 22-37; Lk. 12, 1-12. The first two pericopes are closely related. Luke, on the other hand, represents an independent tradition.

MARK 3, 20-30.

At the first glance everything in the Mark-passage seems clear and plain. Scribes who apparently had come for that very purpose from Jerusalem, questioned the character of Jesus in an insidious manner. They told the people he had formed an agreement with the evil one and owed his power over the demons to that infernal pact.

Jesus refutes that attack with words of no uncertain ring. The logic of his statements is absolutely sound. Anybody who possesses but little common sense must admit that Jesus had nothing in common with Beelzebul, but that the two were deadly enemies. Beelzebul is of course anxious to expand his empire and to confirm his dominion over the hearts of men. Jesus destroys that empire and dominion by healing demoniacs. Consequently, Jesus was, not the friend and ally, but the implacable foe and conqueror of the devil.

This convincing refutation of the charge of the scribes is followed immediately by the words: "Verily I tell you: All sins and all blasphemies which they utter shall be forgiven the sons of men; but whosoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit obtains never forgiveness but is guilty of an eternal sin."

According to the context, it is quite clear that Jesus stigmatizes here the infamous slander of his adversaries as a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, a sin that shall not be pardoned in all eternity. The structure of the text presents not the least sign indicating that v. 28 f. does not continue originally and organically v. 22-27.

Besides, the evangelist himself adds to the blasphemy, saying the explanatory remark: "For they were saying: He has an unclean spirit." The "they" are the scribes; the "he" is Jesus. The sentence, "He has an unclean spirit," repeats the thought which we find expressed in v. 22 by the words: "He has Beelzebul."

The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit consists, therefore, according to the direct testimony of the evangelist in the defamation of Jesus by the scribes. We are dealing with a sin of which the outspoken enemies of our Lord had become guilty.

But with what right may that attempt of casting suspicion

upon Jesus be called a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit? It was, in the first place and directly, a sin against Jesus. It could be taken for a direct blasphemy against the Holy Spirit only if Jesus and the Holy Spirit were identical. But that is certainly not the case. Moreover, in the parallel passage in Matthew (cp. Lk. 12, 10), a blasphemy against Jesus is expressly distinguished from a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. "Whosoever speaks a word against the Son of Man shall obtain forgiveness; but whosoever speaks against the Holy Spirit shall not obtain forgiveness." If we are to judge from these words, the sin of the scribes cannot have consisted chiefly in the fact that they said something against Jesus. This fact could only in an indirect way have constituted their grievous sin.

The saying of Jesus in Mark conveys to us no definite meaning unless we assume that the Holy Spirit of which Jesus is speaking is not the specifically Christian Spirit which he first imparted to his followers. The scribes neither possessed nor knew of that Spirit. They thus were hardly in a position in which they might sin against it. Jesus must have in mind that Spirit, which, even before his arrival, was active in the world at large and especially among the people of Israel, that Spirit of which the scribes themselves were convinced to own a certain measure. That the Jews believed in such a Holy Spirit need not be proved. The Holy Spirit, the divine wisdom, was from the very beginning the heavenly light which had guided and enlightened all the men of God among the chosen people. The scribes themselves owed their knowledge of God and his holy will to the revelation of that Spirit.

Under these circumstances, the blasphemy of the scribes against the Holy Spirit could only be discovered in the fact that their slandering Jesus was a sin against their own better knowledge and understanding, against the testimony of the Holy Spirit, speaking to them through their own conscience. What Jesus said in his own defense, they ought to have said to themselves before they started to vilify him.

To use plain, modern language, Jesus seems to have told his hearers and detractors: Your common sense ought to have prevented you from bringing such a foolish charge against me. Everybody knows well enough that the devil does not destroy

his own work. But you permitted yourselves to be carried away by envy and hatred to accuse me against your own better judgment of being a tool of the evil one. Anybody who thus for hateful and egotistical reasons opposes anything as bad and wicked, though it is evidently and absolutely good and holy, commits thereby the unpardonable sin of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit.

It is superfluous to waste any words as to the possible significance of the term "eternal sin." It is sufficient to refer to the parallelism of members which shows itself so distinctly in the two sentences:

He never obtains forgiveness,
but is guilty of eternal sin.

The one statement explains the other.

Our Mark-pericope seems to possess all those excellent features and qualities which recommend this gospel as the oldest and most trustworthy to so many scholars. Its language is concise and transparent. The account is free from verbosity and superfluous repetitions. We understand readily what the writer intends to tell us.

But we must not overlook that the pericope is evidently incomplete. The original introduction, relating how it came to pass that the scribes made that insidious charge against Jesus has been lost in some way. Vs. 20-21 cannot supply this want. Those verses are rather two disconnected and, as they now stand, contradictory fragments. Their very appearance in their present place proves that the compiler of the gospel was aware he had to fill out a lacuna.

Let us first consider the statement *ἐπέρει εἰς οἶκον*. These words, according to the general Greek as well as to the New Testament usage, mean nothing else but "he comes into a house," "he goes into a house," or "he enters a house." (Cp. R. V.). Nevertheless, they are usually understood to mean "he came to his home," i. e., he returned from one of his missionary excursions to the place where he had his permanent abode. Gould (Int. Crit. Comment., Mark p. 61), f. inst., states: "*εἰς οἶκον* is here probably the colloquial anarthrous phrase, equivalent to our *home*. But he fails entirely to show that this *anarthrous* phrase

ever occurs in any other place. The classical Greek expression of this idea of home is *οἰκαδε*, or *οἰκόνδε*. These words are not found in the New Testament. The synoptists say instead *ἐρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ* (Mk. 6, 1)’ or *ἡλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἰδαν πὰλιν* (Mt. 9, 1). If we read in v. 20 *ἐρχεται εἰς οἴκον αὐτοῦ*, or *εἰς τὸν οἴκον*, we might accept Gould’s translation. As it is, however, the phrase is not only anarthrous, but also lacks the possessive genitive of the pronoun.

Oikos is used by the New Testament writers 112 times. (Moulton & Geden, Concordance of the Greek Testament). It denotes, if we pay no attention to Mk. 3, 20, 63 times a house, i. e., a building inhabited by men. It signifies 15 times in a closely related sense the temple, the dwelling place of God. In one of these 15 cases, however, it has a figurative meaning. In 20 instances, the word is a synonym of “family” because, of course, originally the members of a family lived in one and the same house. The phrase “house of David,” which we find 3 times, is only a special application of the word in this general sense. The terms “house of Jacob,” “house of Israel,” “house of Judah,” occurring 10 times, belong to this same class. For the people of Israel was believed to have descended from one ancestor and formed accordingly one large family. These facts compel us to translate the first sentence of v. 20, “he came into a house.” Whose house it was, we cannot tell.

Nobody would have dreamt of suggesting another translation of *ἐρχεται εἰς οτκον*, if we did not find in the immediately following v. 21 the statement *οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατήσαι αὐτὸν*. If Jesus and his companions were in a house, it would be sheer nonsense to say that somebody belonging to that party came out to take hold of him. In order to remove or, at least, to cover up that evident contradiction, the first sentence is slightly changed in translating it. Most men do that without even being aware of it. It is quite natural to them that, since Jesus was not within a house according to v. 21, v. 20 cannot inform us that he went into a house.

But no real advantage is gained by that unconscious artifice. For v. 20 b. indicates clearly enough that Jesus was actually inside a house. We read there: “A multitude gathered again so that they could not even eat bread.” Jesus and his disciples

were evidently guests at that house, but the crowd pressed them so closely and questioned them so eagerly that they could not partake of the most simple food, not to speak of more elaborate dishes.

That does not remove the contradiction which exists between v. 20 and v. 21, but confirms as correct that translation of v. 20 a which adheres strictly to the New Testament meaning of the word *oikos*.

V. 21 presents still another problem. It is contained in the words: "When *oi παρ' αδροῦ* heard it, they went out to lay hold on him." *Oi παρ' αδροῦ* are said to be here the relatives of Jesus, especially his mother and his brothers. But that explanation is undeniably opposed by the general use of the phrase and preposition not alone in the New Testament, but also in all other Greek writers. The phrase occurring in v. 21 may denote indeed the relatives of a person, but such relatives must be descendants. For *παρά* with the genitive signifies that from the side of which something comes. As Jesus had no children, *oi παρ' αδροῦ* can be only those who acted as his representatives, i. e., his disciples.

Nobody would think of claiming any other meaning for the phrase in our passage, if the proper translation would not emphasize the contradiction between v. 20 and v. 21. For since, in accordance with v. 20, Jesus was together with his disciples in the same house, the latter could not come out of any house for the purpose of seizing the former.

There are still other reasons why it is impossible to suppose that *oi παρ' αδροῦ* could mean the relatives of Jesus. First of all the verb *ἔγινθον* does not fit into the situation even if we should concede that v. 20a might mean "he came home." The simple *γίνοσθαι* would be much better. The preposition *εἰς* could only be explained as follows: Jesus and his disciples had settled down for their lunch right in front of his father's house before he had greeted his mother and his other kinsmen who lived there. That unusual spectacle attracted a large crowd. Their noise and tumult induced his brothers to look into the street to behold to their consternation that Jesus was the center and cause of the uproar. Thereupon they rushed out to seize him. "For they said, he is beside himself." One will see at once that the con-

ception of *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* on which this explanation rests must be wrong.

In addition we possess the explicit testimony of v. 31 to the effect that the mother and brothers of Jesus were not present during the Beelzebul and blasphemy dispute. The words *καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μάγιστρος αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ* tell us explicitly that the relatives of Jesus appeared on the scene neither before nor during, but after the event related in vs. 20-30.

There is no other satisfactory solution of the problem which confronts us in v. 20 and v. 21 but to recognize in these two verses fragments which originally belonged to two entirely different accounts and have been put together only accidentally by the compiler of our gospel, who with conscientious care collected and preserved every little bit of information about Jesus Christ which came into his possession. To which happenings in the career of Jesus these fragments refer cannot be made out from our passage alone.

V. 21 belongs as little to v. 22 as to v. 20. The scribes from Jerusalem were clearly bent upon breaking and undermining the influence Jesus was gaining over the hearts of the common people. From the present context, it would appear that the disciples or, for that matter, the relatives of Jesus, tried to lay hold on him at the same time, because they were afraid he had become insane. Such an attempt of the nearest relations of the hated teacher would certainly have been welcomed by the scribes. It would have saved them the risk of becoming unpopular they certainly ran when they opposed Jesus in public. All they had to do was to approve of what the relatives of Jesus were attempting. They probably would have said: You are right. This man is beside himself. He must be prevented from inflicting harm upon himself and others. He is very dangerous. Beelzebul, the prince of the devils, has taken possession of him.

Instead of talking in such a vein, they bear witness to the fact that Jesus had cast out devils. Of an act of exorcism, however, neither v. 20 nor v. 21 betrays the faintest knowledge. Besides, such an extraordinary deed, presupposing the possession of extraordinary powers would never have been taken as indicating that Jesus had lost his mind. All the eye-witnesses of such a won-

derful performance would have been filled thereby with wonder and admiration.

We thus must come to the conclusion that v. 21, and v. 22 ff. are loose and disconnected chips of information put together in their present place in a purely mechanical way like beads on a string. For, on account of its missing introduction, even the Beelzebul episode in Mark must be considered as incomplete and fragmentary.

The original introduction of that story in the complete source from which Mark derived his information must have been similar to the introduction we find in Matthew and Luke. In the former we read, f. inst.: "A demoniac who was blind and dumb was brought to him. And he healed him so that the dumb man spoke and saw. And all the people were amazed and said, 'Is not this man the son of David?'" To counteract this overpowering effect which the healing of the possessed one exercised upon the mind of the people, the Pharisees stooped to the base slander: "He casts out the devils only by Beelzebul, the prince of the devils." There is no necessity of explaining how natural, logical, and historical that is.

These observations render it quite clear that the Mark-pericope of the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit can hardly be styled a model of plain and simple story telling. It has proved to be a mosaic composed of at least three different and incongruent layers. For that reason we cannot be very sure whether, in the end, vs. 22-30 will not appear likewise to be, not one organic whole, but a collection composed of different pieces. But since the text presents no marked inconsistencies, this question cannot be answered at present.

MATTHEW 12, 22-37.

Turning now to Mat. 12, 22-37, that version of the blasphemy-account appears to agree perfectly up to the end of v. 31 with the Mark-pericope, putting, of course, aside the introduction which Mark has omitted. One might even prefer the Matthew-version to that of Mark chiefly because it is complete. Yet two little additions, intended to make the wonderful healing of the demoniac look still more wonderful, have crept into the text. The

Beelzebul-episode in Matthew has its parallel in Lk. 11, 14 ff. According to Luke, the possessed one is only dumb; Jesus by casting out the unclean spirit restores his faculty of speech. Mt. 12, 22, he is called the first time *τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός*. But, the second time, in the same verse, he is simply *κωφός* just as in Luke. My impression, therefore, is that both the words *τυφλὸς καὶ* as well as *καὶ βλέπειν* are glosses in Mt. 12, 22. The strange order, first, blind and dumb, then, hear and see, does not recommend itself to my feeling as a stylistic trick, a so-called chiasm. I am rather inclined to behold therein the hand of one, if not two glos-sators. But, it has to be admitted that this is a point of very subordinate importance.

A really important difficulty arises when we come to v. 32-37. The whole tenor of these sayings is indeed in harmony with what Jesus has said before about Beelzebul and about the blasphemy. But we meet with the same sayings elsewhere, not alone in Luke but also in Matthew itself, in quite a different connection. Cp., with v. 33-35, Mt. 6, 16-18 & Lk. 6, 43-45. We therefore may, we almost must, doubt whether they form an original and integral part of the Beelzebul-and blasphemy-speech. In that respect, the Mark version is superior to that found in Matthew.

We might, however, remove these difficulties by supposing that the compilers of sayings of Jesus added together all the words of the Lord that had come to their knowledge either as they happened to find them or as it seemed best in their judgment. That we find them now standing close together is not in itself an unassailable proof that they were uttered by Jesus as organic parts of the same discourse.

It is especially v. 32 which has always presented the greatest difficulties to the commentators. It reads: "Whosoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, shall obtain forgiveness; but who speaks against the Holy Spirit shall obtain forgiveness neither in the present world nor in the world to come."

This statement has been quoted before in order to emphasize that blasphemy against Jesus is not necessarily identical with a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. But since the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit consists both in Mark and Matthew in a blasphemy against Jesus, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to define the difference. Allen (Int. Crit. Comment., Mt. p. 136)

says: "Of the two, Mark's phrase is probably the more accurate translation. 'Anything shall be forgiven to men save blasphemy against the Holy Spirit,' gives a clear and intelligible meaning. On the other hand, 'Opposition to the Son of Man is pardonable, opposition to the Holy Spirit is unpardonable' is difficult to explain."

One might say: The slandering of Jesus by the scribes was not a blasphemy because it was intended to hurt Jesus. It would have been a blasphemy also if it had been directed under similar conditions against anybody else, f. inst., against one of his apostles. The corresponding application would accordingly be as follows: Everybody commits the sin of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit who, from motives of envy and hatred, stigmatizes a good deed of any person as a wicked deed. But, still the question would be whether Jesus really intended to express that idea. It would certainly be a strange phenomenon that the commentators have not accepted long ago this apparently so simple explanation.

Some have suggested that v. 32 is merely a repetition of v. 31. The two verses are according to their opinion nothing but two different versions of one and the same saying with a strong probability that v. 31 preserves the original form.

One fact cannot be denied. The Matthew-account contains serious difficulties. We must therefore admit that something is wrong with the saying of Jesus about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in Matthew not less than in Mark. That conclusion is of a nature to cast serious doubts upon everything that has been advanced so far in order to define wherein the unpardonable sin of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit really consists. Of course, there are many who cut the knot by saying: Everything is clear and intelligible in Mark. What that plain and simple narrator records must be the truth. If the verbose Matthew, who inclines to repetitions, does not agree with Mark, so much the worse for Matthew. It only demonstrates that he is the less reliable gatherer of the apostolic traditions. But who has the authority of assuring us of the absolute reliability of Mark? Who has given us the right to extol the one above the other? Who permits us to neglect and bury in silence the testimony of any of them?

In any case, the excellencies so generally credited to Mark have thus far not been discovered in the Beelzebul-blasphemy-pericope. The aphoristic character of the introductory verses in the Mark-account raised rather the question whether the later verses might not likewise turn out to be disconnected sayings of Jesus. It is furthermore out of the question to determine with any degree of assurance the relationship of the here discussed passages in the two gospels. One thing is sure. Mark cannot have had before himself the Matthew account while he incorporated the pericope in his work. For no sensible reason can be stated why he should have omitted on purpose the original introduction, contained in Matthew. On the other hand, we cannot say that Mark's pericope is the older model on which Matthew based his account. The latter's introduction awakens in no way the suspicion of being an afterthought.

But even if we pass by the introduction, the shortness and simplicity of the Mark account is by no means a sure indication of its greater age. If anybody attempts to review shortly the Matthew pericope, his account is bound to be more or less identical with the Mark-pericope, and Mt. 12, 32 will surely be omitted. A second version of any story, as a second edition of any book, is, as we all know, not always less distinct and more verbose in its statements than the first. A second narrator may, and generally will, improve on his model.

The Mark-pericope may therefore after all be older than that handed down in Mark. The former in any case has made use of a complete source, whereas Mark has relied on a defective copy. But that does not mean that we have to solve the extremely difficult problem as to how the synoptists are related to each other. I only desire to make it quite clear that Mark and Matthew do not enable us to answer definitely and convincingly the question wherein the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit consists. Mt. 12, 32 seems to indicate that there existed a double tradition of the blasphemy-saying.

LUKE 12, 1-12.

We are extremely fortunate in possessing additional material for our investigation in Lk. 12, 1-12. But there, the first thing

to strike us as strange is that the Beelzebul-episode in Luke and the blasphemy-saying are separated from one another. The healing of the dumb demoniac and the Beelzebul-dispute, called forth thereby, are contained in Lk. 11, 14-26. The blasphemy-saying, however, is found in Lk. 12, 1-12. These two, in Luke altogether independent pericopes are divided in space by the rather long passage, Lk. 11, 27-53.

But there is still another and even more significant difference to be observed between Mark and Matthew on the one hand and Luke on the other. Lk. 11, 14-26, just as Mk. 3, 22-30 and Mt. 12, 22 ff., Jesus addresses the general public, including those who had tried to cast suspicion upon him as being in partnership with the evil one. But what he has to say Lk. 12, 1-12 is meant exclusively for his intimate disciples. That follows in the first place from the short sentence which introduces the words of Jesus. *ηρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τὸν μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ* (v. 1). It furthermore appears from the whole tenor of the speech. It is composed of advice, admonition, warning, and encouragement—of interest, not for the great mass of the people, but for his chosen fellow-laborers. It is finally confirmed by the fact that the greater portion of the pericope (Lk. 12, 2-9), has its parallel in Mt. 10, 26-33. The latter passage belongs likewise to the body of those instructions which Jesus, according to Matthew, gave to his twelve apostles just prior to their first missionary journey.

Nothing but the words *ἐν οἷς ἐπιστραχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τῶν δχλον ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀμῆλους.* (Lk. 12, 1) seems to oppose that view. But those words must have been added to the original text by the editor. They have caused as such the insertion of *πρῶτον* after *μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ* in v. 1 b. That little word was to hide as far as practicable the direct contradiction between the editorial statement and the original introduction of the missionary instructions, given by Jesus to his disciples. What Jesus has to say in v. 2-12 was neither intended for the general public nor spoken in the presence of a tumultuous multitude so unruly that people were trampled upon. Jesus, as a matter of course, as well as all other sensible men, has always taken care to make his private communications in private. Mt. 10, 27 seems to state directly that Jesus was alone with his apostles when he was preparing them for their missionary work. But the editor of

the gospel took it evidently for granted that Jesus, when teaching, was constantly and everywhere surrounded by an enormous gathering of listeners. The sayings of Jesus, contained in Lk. 12, were in his estimation so important that he supposed they were pronounced in the presence of an innumerable throng. Their importance for those whom they concerned cannot indeed be overestimated. But that does not imply that Jesus at that occasion cast his pearls before swine.

The Luke account differs not alone with respect to its position from that of the two other gospels. There exists yet another difference of much greater significance. In Mark and Matthew, the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a sin of the scribes and Pharisees, the outspoken opponents of Jesus. In Luke, this blasphemy is a sin against which Jesus warns his most intimate disciples, the men destined to propagate his work. Not his irreconcilable enemies, but his nearest and dearest friends are exposed to the danger and temptation of rendering themselves guilty of that most heinous, in all eternity unpardonable sin. The supreme importance of that fact cannot be stated too emphatically.

In spite of all these differences most commentators dismiss the Luke-account simply with the remark: "We cannot doubt that Matthew and Mark give the actual historical connection of the blasphemy saying." (Plummer, Int. Crit. Comment., Lk. p. 321.) The only possibility of ascribing to the Luke version any value whatsoever, these people find in assuming that Jesus may have used the phrase of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit at more than one occasion. But that device must not be taken too seriously. We all know well enough that Jesus cannot have condemned more than one sinful act as the same and, moreover, alone unpardonable sin. Sensible people are well aware that there is but one superlative.

Bearing in mind that we discovered different elements in the beginning of the Mark pericope, we can no longer absolutely deny that Mk. 3, 28-29 may have been taken from a source foreign to Mk. 3, 22-27, quite as well as v. 20 and v. 21. That possibility is not weakened by the queer character of the Matthew account, especially of Mt. 12, 32. If, besides, the Beelzebul-episode and the blasphemy-saying are related in Luke as two en-

tirely independent things which have nothing in common, we must not try to avoid the obligation of examining that strange phenomenon to the bottom.

We are not compelled to probe the whole passage, Lk. 12, 1-12. It is only necessary to determine correctly what v. 10 means in its connection with the two preceding (v. 8-9) and the two following verses (v. 11-12). Those five verses read:

"Everyone who confesses me before the people the Son of Man shall also confess before the angels of God.

"But who denies me before the people shall be denied before the angels of God.

"And everybody who speaks a word against the Son of Man shall obtain forgiveness;

"But who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit shall not find forgiveness.

"Whenever they shall place you before the synagogues and magistrates and rulers, be not anxious how you shall defend yourselves or what you shall say. For the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what you ought to say."

The first thing to be done here is to explain the phrase *εἰς τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημεῖν*. The verb *βλασφημεῖν* is used by the classical authors only as an intransitive verb and governs either the preposition *περὶ* or *κατά* with the genitive or *εἰς* with the accusative in order to denote the logical object of blaspheming. In the New Testament age meanwhile, the verb had become transitive and expressed its direct object by the simple accusative. That is done, f. inst., by Plutarch. That is also the usage of the New Testament writers. The verb has accordingly a personal passive in the New Testament. It is used several times absolutely. But, in those cases, the direct object is readily implied from the context. The only New Testament passage where the preposition *εἰς* with the accusative is employed in connection with *βλασφημεῖν* is the saying of Jesus about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The verb occurs, by the way, not less than 34 times in the New Testament.

We consequently are bound to conclude that *εἰς τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα* can be neither grammatically nor logically the direct object of *βλασφημεῖν* in our passage. The translation "blaspheming the Holy Spirit" would be entirely wrong.

According to the whole context in Luke, the blaspheming against the Holy Spirit must be, in the first place, a sin of the disciples of Jesus. For they are expressly warned to beware of it. In the second place, that sin, in conformity with v. 9, must be an act by which the disciples denied and blasphemed their master before men. In the third place, according to v. 11, that abominable offense is committed before either an ecclesiastical or a secular court of justice.

We may therefore assert with confidence that, in Luke, a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is done when disciples of Jesus, out of fear of human judges deny and blaspheme their Master in public. Public blaspheming at such occasions was, at that time, quite a usual thing both among Jews and Gentiles. It probably was demanded by law. The old bishop Polycarp declared before his judges: "I have served Christ for eighty-six years; and he has done me nothing but good. How could I blaspheme him, my Lord and Savior?" Mart. Polyc. 9 Ep. Eus. H. E. IV 8, 4; V 1, 16; 25. That the same custom prevailed in the synagogues, is evident from Act. 26, 11. The apostle Paul speaks there of his own doings as persecutor of Christians. "I punished them oftentimes in all synagogues and compelled them to blaspheme." The direct object, which is not expressed, in Lk. 12, 10, as well as in Act. 26, 11, is therefore *Jesus*.

At the first glance, this explanation seems to be at odds with the first half of Lk. 12, 10. "Everybody who speaks a word against the Son of Man shall obtain forgiveness." But the blaspheming of the Son of Man in the second half of the verse is, in the first place, modified by the prepositional phrase *εἰς τὸ ἄγνοι πνεῦμα*, it is called, in the second place, *βλασφημῶν*, a legal term of special and well known meaning, and is in both ways sufficiently distinguished from any general ill-speaking against Jesus. The first sentence refers to utterances of hatred, coming forth from the mouth of adversaries of Jesus. They are expressions of an honest, though a mistaken, conviction cherished at the time. They may, for that very reason be forgiven. The prayer of Jesus, "Father forgive them. For they know not what they are doing," applies to such attacks of an ignorant fanaticism. The first sentence of Lk. 12, 10 (ep. Mt. 12, 32),

states thus distinctly that the Beelzebul-slander of Jesus by the scribes was not a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit at all. The second sentence of v. 10 speaks of a denying and blaspheming of Jesus by his convinced adherents, who, under compulsion, from pale fear of men and abject cowardice gainsay and curse their true belief. That must indeed be considered an unpardonable sin. For it endangers the existence of the kingdom of God. Enmity of any kind may be overcome. Cowardice is condemned to be conquered without hope.

Such a public blaspheming of Jesus may fittingly be called a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Jesus and his disciples knew that belief in Jesus Christ was the fruit and result of a special revelation of the Holy Spirit. When, according to Matthew, Peter had confessed: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!" Jesus answered: "Thou art blessed, Simon son of Jonah. For flesh and blood has not revealed that to thee, but my Father in heaven." Paul writes 1 Cor. 12, 3: "Nobody who speaks in the spirit of God blasphemes Jesus; and nobody can say 'Lord Jesus' except in the Holy Spirit."

In this way, blaspheming Jesus out of cowardice, against one's true conviction, against the testimony of the Holy Spirit in one's own heart, constitutes the eternally unpardonable sin of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit. That is confirmed finally by the words of v. 12: "The Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what you ought to say." When the disciples in such a dangerous hour will listen to the voice of the Holy Spirit in themselves, instead of denying and blaspheming Jesus against that testimony, the right words of proper defense will rise to their lips so to say automatically, without a conscious effort on their part because the Holy Spirit will speak through them.

CLOSING REMARKS.

The preceding investigation has demonstrated that the synoptic gospels contain a double tradition of the saying of Jesus about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The one is presented by Mark. According to his account, that blasphemy is a sin of which the scribes, opponents and enemies of Jesus, have become guilty. That conception renders it very difficult, if not

absolutely dangerous, to apply the saying of Jesus to our own times and conditions. Our personal opinions, especially those of a religious nature, are in most cases so clear and convincing, so sensible and self-evident in our own eyes that we cannot understand how anybody may reject them. Thus we are tempted ever again to behold in such deviations from what is in our judgment the only truth a sure indication of a perverse will, of a hardened heart, of the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

In the Luke account, on the other hand, that blasphemy is not a sin which we have to espy in the conduct of other people but for which we have to look alone into our own hearts. We ourselves may deny and blaspheme that Jesus Christ whom the Holy Spirit has revealed unto us. In dealing with this sin, there is not the least danger of doing injustice to our fellow-men. The worst thing we might do would be to deceive ourselves and to imagine never to have blasphemed against the Holy Spirit long after having done so. Nowadays, of course, nobody is forced to deny and blaspheme the Lord in such a brutal manner as during the apostolic and the first succeeding ages. But it may happen that, now and then, a man denies his true religious convictions and even engages in combating them in others by word of mouth or with his pen, because he is anxious to secure certain material advantages he could not gain otherwise, or to avoid and conciliate the enmity of such upon whose good will his worldly success depends. But, we are bound under all circumstances to search our own heart and conscience, not that of other people, for that grievous fault.

The account of Matthew stands midway between Mark and Luke. Mt. 12, 22-31 is a parallel version to Mk. 3, 22-30. Mt. 12, 32, however, is clearly parallel to Lk. 12, 10. That latter relationship is the more important as the commentators have always had a strong feeling of the disagreement between Mt. 12, 31 and Mt. 12, 32.

The differences between the Mark-and the Luke-version are of such a kind that they exclude each other. Either the one or the other account hands down to us the original blasphemy-saying of Jesus. Matthew cannot be called up as witness to decide the question. He simply testifies to the existence of both traditions. Since thus the weight of outward testimony is equal on both

sides, only inward reasons and considerations can induce us to prefer either the Mark-or the Luke-account.

One might say indeed that the evident organic unity of the Luke account is a strong indication of its original genuineness as compared with the fragmentary character of Mk. 3, 20-30.

Besides, there is a second consideration which seems to incline the balance in favor of the Luke-tradition. It is more than difficult to conceive how, as a later development, the Luke-version could have grown out of an original Mark version. The Christians, in very early times, have honored and revered the apostles as almost superhuman beings. It must have seemed incredible to them that Jesus should have had to warn those holy men against the worst of all sins, the only eternally unpardonable offense. Only the inhuman enemies of Jesus were wicked enough to commit such an indefensible act. Nothing was therefore easier than to add such fragmentary sayings of Jesus to words he had addressed to scribes and Pharisees. The opposite process could not be explained psychologically.

Pittsburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VI.

THE QUIN-CENTENARY JUBILEE OF LEIPSIC UNIVERSITY.

BY REV. H. E. BERKEY.

With the close of the Summer Semester, July 31, 1909, Leipsic University completed an existence of five hundred years. The event was celebrated with exercises befitting its importance.

The editor of the *QUARTERLY* in his request for "an account of the great Leipzig Jubilee," has included the suggestion, "together with such historical matters as are germane." Acting on this suggestion, we notice:

I. THE STAGE OF THE WORLD'S PROGRESS WHEN LEIPSIC UNIVERSITY WAS FOUNDED.

History was then nearing the close of the Mediaeval Period. Dante, one of that period's finest spirits, was not yet a century dead. Petrarch, the father of modern humanism, had gone but a third of a century. Ptolemaic conceptions of the universe still held sway. Half of the world was as yet unknown. America was not discovered. Columbus wasn't even born; neither were Copernicus, Tycho Brahe, Savonarola, Luther—none of the reformers—nor Bacon, Shakespeare, Milton, Newton, Harvey, nor Galileo. Gutenberg was perhaps a boy of nine (birth date uncertain) and printing yet to be invented. The Renaissance was in bloom. The Council of Pisa had just chosen Alexander V. as compromise pope, and thus "the world had the edifying spectacle of three contemporary popes anathematising one another."¹ The Reformation was more than a hundred years in the future.

With this brief view of the world when Leipsic was founded, we notice:

II. THE ORIGIN OF LEIPSIC UNIVERSITY.

Leipsic University grew out of, German writers say, unfair treatment of the German students in attendance at the then

¹ Kurtz: *Church History*, II. p. 147.

great Bohemian university of Prague. Bohemian and other writers think some of the unfairness was on the part of the Germans.²

"Prague was modeled on the status of the universities then of chief note in Europe, as those of Paris and Bologna, where, in questions involving university honors and emoluments, three votes were given to the native, and one vote to the foreign members. But as, during the infancy of the University of Prague, there was a much larger number of students from various parts of the German Empire than from Bohemia, this proportion was reversed. Thus university honors and rewards were almost monopolized by the Germans; and as the native students increased in numbers, this naturally occasioned much chagrin and discontent."³

Jerome of Prague, has left a graphic account of the situation, and of what he and John Huss, afterwards reformer and martyr, and at this time a popular preacher and professor of theology at Prague, did to right it. "The Germans formed the majority, and engrossed to themselves the offices of honor and profit, to the prejudice of the Bohemians, who were stripped of all. The Germans disposed of the university's benefices. They kept its seal. They had charge of its keys. They had three voices out of four in its suffrages, instead of being counted as a single nation.....I perceived this as did Master John Huss,We, therefore, in order to put a stop to these things, went to the present king of Bohemia....."⁴ This appeal resulted in "the famous decree of Kutna Hora" to reverse the representation in the university.⁵

When the universities of Vienna, Heidelberg, and Erfurt, were founded, the number of German students at Prague decreased. Yet, owing to the original rule of representation, the Germans still controlled. Huss admitted the original justice of the rule, But now that conditions were reversed, he argued, the rule should be reversed also. At this "so exasperated were the Germans that

² Mosheim: *Church History*, Murdock-Ried Tr. p. 528; Count Lützow: *Life and Times of Master John Hus*, N. Y., 1908, pp. 67 f.

³ Rogers: *Essays (The Story of John Huss)*, pp. 98-9.

⁴ Quoted in Gellert: *Life and Times of John Huss*, 3rd. ed. N. Y. 1871, Vol. II. pp. 223-4.

⁵ Mosheim, p. 528; Lützow, p. 105.

they agreed should the alteration take place, they would leave the university *en masse*; and, it is further said, decreed that if any were obstinate enough to refuse taking a part in this *exodus*, he should expiate his guilt by the loss of two of his fingers.... a somewhat curious illustration of the humanising effect of letters."⁶

Whether any fingers were lost, or whether this was only someone's libel of the Germans, we do not know. At any rate the rule was changed by the Bohemians, and the threatened exodus of the Germans took place in May, 1409.⁷ The Germans, including the rector Boltenhagen and Professors Hoffman and Von Münsterberg to the number of about four hundred, retired to Leipsic, where under the auspices of Frederick the Valiant, and the decree of the pope (Alexander V., from Pisa, see Friedberg p. 9, Blanckmeister, p. 4) then necessary, Leipsic University was founded.

With this view of the origin of Leipsic, we pass to:

III. LEIPSIC'S RELATION TO THE REFORMATION.

Leipsic's attitude to the Reformation was at first hostile. Though only about forty miles from Wittenberg, the center of the Reformation, Leipsic, at the beginning, held aloof and used her influence against Luther. This was due to Duke George, in whose dominions Leipsic was situated. On the occasion of the Leipsic Disputation, he did indirectly permit Luther to come to Leipsic, "under Carlstadt's wing."⁸ However at the Disputation he took a dislike to Luther, forbade his Bible, had Emser issue a rival New Testament, executed a bookseller who sold Luther's books, and would have been glad to see Luther burned. But the death of this adversary helped the Protestant cause. Duke George's successor introduced the Reformation. Thus twenty years after the Leipsic Disputation, Luther had the satisfaction of preaching in Leipsic at Pentecost. With this change, Leipsic became, and remains to this day, the chief Lutheran uni-

⁶ Rogers: *Essays*, pp. 98-9.

⁷ Friedberg: *Die Universität Leipzig in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, p. 9.

⁸ Küstlin: *Martin Luther sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Band I. S. 238.

versity.⁹ And from the ashes of the executed bookseller there has arisen there the greatest Protestant book trade in the world.¹⁰

Along the line of history, we may notice further:

IV. LEIPSIC'S RELATION TO THE THOUGHT OF HER TIMES.

We have just seen this as to the Reformation. In general, Leipsic from her beginning, through the greater part of her history, with notable exceptions, has been allied with conservatism. Hence Dr. Schaff could write that though distinguished along other lines, "Leipsic rarely gives rise to new ideas or systems of thought."¹¹ Her founders before leaving Prague were on the side of the pope and against Huss and reform.¹² At the time of the Reformation, most of the Leipsic theological faculty were more conservative than Duke George himself. For even though he gave his consent to the Leipsic Disputation, the university theologians for the most part opposed it.¹³

After the Reformation, Leipsic's position theologically varied. At one time liberal, at another time conservative ideas prevailed.¹⁴ Kirn notes the difficulties that were in the way of "every original and vigorous thinker" in the seventeenth century, and the burdens on the faculty, due to the over-working of the Formula of Concord.¹⁵ Pietism was strongly opposed by Leipsic. In recent times, Leipsic has been somewhat influenced by liberal critical thought. But conservative ideas are not by any means unknown there.

9 Berlin has more students but is less Lutheran than Leipsic.

10 Cf. Schaff: *Church History*, VI. pp. 567-8.

11 *Germany, Its Universities, &c.* p. 79.

12 Lützow, p. 101 f.

13 Köstlin: *Martin Luther*, I. S. 237; Brandenburg, et al.: *Die Universität Leipsic, 1409-1909, Gedenkblätter*, p. 8.

14 Cf. Richard: *The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church*, pp. 527-8; Kirn: *Festschrift zur feier des 500 jährigen Bestehens der Universität Leipzig*, S. 61, 87.

15 Vor allem bilden die Streitigkeiten über die Lehre ein nie versiegendes Thema. Seitdem in der Konkordienformel der Weg eines detailierten Lehrbekenntnisses beschritten war, entstand gegenüber jedem originell und energischen Religiösen die Frage, ob er nicht gegen diese Lehrnorm verstossen. Sie konnte nur von gewieften Fachmännern entscheiden werden und die Fakultäten ließen sich die ihnen so zufallende Rolle der Lehrgerichtshöfe, die ihr öffentliches Ansehen erhöhte, gerne gefallen." *Festschrift usw.* Band I. S. 87.

Before passing to a consideration of the *Jubilee* we may notice yet:

V. SOME NOTED LEIPSIC MEN.

Among her leading theological professors in the past have been¹⁶ Selnecker, joint author of the Formula of Concord; Hülsemann, J. B. Carpzov II., J. Olearius, C. A. Crusius; Winer, the New Testament Grammarian, Harless, Kahnis, Luthardt, Lechler, Tischendorf, the New Testament textual critic and discoverer and editor of the *Codex Sinaticus*, Delitzsch, and Zahn, the greatest conservative professor in Germany.¹⁷

Of present Leipsic theologians, Ihmels and Hauck are the most prominent. Ihmels is professor of dogmatic theology, and an earnest, energetic, thorough, (it need not be added scholarly) advocate of conservative views. He is the head of the *Allgemeine Lutherische Conference*. Hauck is the best historian in Germany. A few years ago his Church History of Germany won the thousand dollar prize for the best work on German history. He is also the editor of the new *Herzog Realencyklopädie*, the most learned work of its class in existence. His style is a marvel of simplicity for a German.

Other noted Leipsic men have been Gellert, Wächter, Gottsched, Windscheid, Thiersch, Roscher, and Zarneke. Among her famous students have been: Körner, Jean Paul, Goethe, Lessing, and Leibniz. August Hermann Francke was a Leipsic graduate, and, for a time instructor. He originated his famous *collegium bibliicum* there.

With this view of Leipsic's past we come now to notice:

VI. THE JUBILEE.

The *Jubilee* celebrating the Quin-Centenary of Leipsic, was held July 28-31, 1909.

¹⁶ The *Lutheran Cycloedia*, article *Universities*, gives Calvo, Quenstedt, and Val. Löscher among leading Leipsic professors. This is a mistake. They were professors but not at Leipsic. Cf. PREß and Blankmeister: *Die theologische Fakultät der Universität Leipzig in fünf Jahrhunderten*, pp. 44-51. Selnecker, Winer, Delitzsch, and Tischendorf are omitted from the *Luth. Cpd.*

¹⁷ He has done most of his work at Erlangen. His *Introduction to the New Testament* is the ablest work on the subject. It has been issued more than a decade, yet so far no liberal critic has been able to answer its arguments. It has just been issued in this country in English.

The guests of honor were received in the Hall (*Aula*) of the University on the 28th, 7.30 P. M., and at 9 P. M., went to an informal (from the German standpoint) reception in the Palm Garden.

On Thursday (29th) 8.05 A. M., the king of Saxony, *Rector magnificientissimus* of the University, was received in the royal waiting room of the Dresden depot, and, amidst great demonstrations, conducted to his palace in Leipsic. Later he was conducted to St. Paul's (University) Church where at 9.30 A. M. a religious service was held at which the notables, from the king and the rector of the University on down attended. The first preacher of the University Church, Prof. Dr. Reitschel, preached the sermon. He based it on Ps. 36:9 (36:10 in the German Bible): "For with thee is the fountain of life: In thy light shall we see light." He spoke of the problems science has raised; of the many different world-views that are held in a great university like Leipsic. They all reach the point where they must confess *ignoramus*, we do not know. And with this confession they realize in their hearts, *ignorabimus*, we shall not know. If man's restless intellect seeks after knowledge, his heart desires something more. "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: When shall I come and appear before God?" When science reaches its limit, man's eye rises to the supernatural, and his heart breaks forth in the consciousness: "Thou, God, hast created us, and restless is our heart until it rests in Thee. With Thee is the fountain of life: In Thy light shall we see light."

At 10.30 A. M., one of the principal exercises of the *Jubilee* was held in the new City Theatre. Here the rector of the University, Dr. Binding, delivered an address of welcome. The king followed in a congratulatory response, whereupon the rector in a further speech, thanked the king. This was followed by a further speech of congratulation by the minister of public worship and education (*Kultusminister*) for Saxony. Next came a deputation of citizens of Leipsic, headed by the mayor. In his congratulatory remarks he said the city was most happy in having a part in the *Jubilee*. As substantial evidence of this he then informed the rector that the city proposed to contribute one hundred thousand marks (\$25,000) as an endowment, the

principal of which is to be kept intact and the interest to be used to provide free board for German students. He at the same time handed the rector a bronze tablet which is to inform future ages of the gift. Of course another *Danksagung* was now due from and was given by the rector.

Next came the congratulations to the university and city of Leipsic, from all the other German universities. To Prof. Windelband, rector of Heidelberg, the oldest of the German universities, was delegated the pleasant duty of doing this verbally. At the close of his remarks the respective representatives of the 21 German universities—Heidelberg, Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Erlangen, Freiburg, Geissen, Göttingen, Greifswald, Halle, Jena, Kiel, Königsberg, Marburg, München, Münster, Rostock, Strasburg, Tübingen, and Würzburg, passed in succession before the rector and handed him the written congratulations of their institutions.

Prof. Weiland, rector of the University of Basle, spoke for the Swiss universities of Basle, Bern, Geneva, Lausanne, Neuchatel, and Zurich.

For the universities of Western Europe, Holland, Belgium, France and Italy, Prof. Chuquet of Paris, was the spokesman.

The universities of Northern and Eastern Europe, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Russia, and Greece, were represented by Prof. Nireen of Upsala.

The universities of the British Empire, had Prof. Matraffy of Dublin, as their speaker.

For our American universities: the State universities of California, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia; Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, Columbia, Cornell, Worcester, and Buenos Ayres, President Schurmann of Cornell, was selected as speaker. He said, among other things, that as yet Germany is in the lead in intellectual matters, but America hopes to attain it. This, however, will only be possible through what America has received from Germany.

The spokesman for the universities of Eastern Asia: Pekin, Tokio, and Kioto, was the Chinese Minister to Germany.

Written congratulations were also received from many other institutions, learned societies, &c., German and foreign, among

them the American Philosophical Society, Drew Theological Seminary, and our own Theological Seminary at Gettysburg.

At the close of this feast of congratulations, the rector once more spoke a concluding word of thanks.

At 6.00 P. M., the same day, a State banquet was given to the guests of honor in the Palm Garden.

On Friday, 9.00 A. M., the main exercises of the *Jubilee* were continued in the Entrance Hall (*Wandelhalle*) of the university. Here the king of Saxony presented the university a marble statue of himself. It was unveiled amidst great applause. The matriculation of the king's two sons, Crown Prince George, and Prince Frederick Christian, as students at Leipsic, followed.

Next came the address of the *Jubilee* delivered by the world-famous psychologist Wundt of the philosophical faculty of Leipsic. That the university and his friends are proud of him was indicated by the prolonged applause that greeted his appearance. He is now seventy-seven years of age, and has published over two hundred articles and books on profound and abstruse subjects pertaining to his department. He spoke for sixty-five minutes in his characteristic way. He took as a basic idea for his address a thought from Leibniz on the course of history: "The past is everywhere prophetic of the future."¹⁸

Following Wundt's address came the conferring of degrees. None but Germans—one Swiss—were honored by the *theological* faculty.

The *legal* faculty regarded the *Jubilee* as warrant to widen the usual limits "Unsere Feier ist ein Weltfest." Therefore on Theodore Roosevelt, designated as "battle-tested, brave, yet peace-working, possessing all the virtues of statesmanship, worthy of a civic crown, having a correct and thorough understanding of German affairs," was conferred the degree of LL.D. "The English ambassador at Washington, James Bryce, an expert on American civic affairs, author of the classic work, '*The American Commonwealth*,'" received a like honor.

At the conclusion of these exercises, there was a mammoth

¹⁸ "Die Vergangenheit ist überall schon erfüllt von der Zukunft! Was heute geschieht—so dürfen wir wohl dies Wort umschreiben—, ist vorbereitet in der Lebensarbeit vergangener Geschlechter; und gelingt es uns, die Richtlinien zu ziehen, die das Entschwundene mit der Gegenwart verbinden, so werden uns diese Linien vielleicht auch den Weg in die Zukunft zeigen."

grand parade of students representing historic events in the university's history. The entrance of the students from Prague to Leipsic in 1409; a model of the Prague cathedral with the arms of the four "Nations" represented at Prague; Frederick the Valiant, founder of the university of Leipsic, and his brother William; the entrance of the Wittenbergers—Luther, Melanchthon, Carlstadt, and others—to the Leipsic Disputation; Tilly giving Leipsic Professors safe conduct; Leibniz, Lessing, Goethe, Körner, as Leipsic students; the University prison (Karzer); officers with the new university flag; were among the events portrayed by students decked out in costly costumes representing the times when the respective events transpired. Expert German artists and historians are said to have spent much time—one of them two years—in working up the ideas for this parade. To help make the parade possible, the diet of Saxony contributed thirty thousand marks.

On Friday evening the university and its guests were given a concert by the management of the *Gewandhaus*; and plays from Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller in the new theatre were provided by the city of Leipsic. Later in the night there was a *Jubilee Drinking Bout (Festkommers)* in a special hall erected on the new fair grounds, and said to have been capable of seating ten thousand persons. Of this, judging from reports, the least said the best. One can only regret that with all the culture and refinement, and goodness of heart, one finds among the Germans, such practices of antiquity should still remain to mar the picture. If the burden of supporting the army should in time make beer prohibitive in price, militarism might not be an unmitigated evil for Germany.

This closed the great Leipsic *Jubilee*, save for a royal banquet, given on Saturday evening by the king to specially invited guests at his palace in Meissen.

During these five hundred years of Leipsic's life, marked changes have taken place. Some contrasts are: the number of students first semester was 369, the one thousandth semester the number (including 821 non-matriculated) was 5,402. Earlier the professors and students lived together; now the former in many instances scarcely know the latter. Then the university boarded the students, and unsatisfactory fare was time and again

paraded 'round town; now the students board where they please, and as far as they will permit, are exploited by all manner of schemes for cheap living. Then the students were taxed to maintain a library to which they could not have access;¹⁹ now the tax continues, and the facilities for its use, while in some respects very good, might be decidedly improved as far as modern indexing and promptness of service are concerned.

Before we close, a word ought perhaps to be said concerning :

VII. MEMENTOS OF THE JUBILEE.

These were numerous and varied. Among the best were four hundred thousand *Jubilee Medals* struck off by the mints. These medals are in the form of special two and five mark silver pieces. Instead of bearing as usual the head of the ruler whose province issues them, these on the obverse bear the heads of Frederick the Valiant, ruler of Saxony when the university was founded, and Frederick August, the present king of Saxony. The encircling legend reads: "Friederich der Streitbare Freiderich August. 1409 Universität Leipzig 1909." These medals were given out by the university, mark for mark, in exchange for ordinary coin of the realm. No student was permitted to buy more than one of each denomination, possibly because it was deemed unwise for them to "tie-up" more funds, if they had them, in that way. The public could have two of each kind per person. The lining up of students and ex-students under special police supervision to secure these medals, was one of the interesting events of the *Jubilee*. The writer stood in line for more than an hour, in a column four deep, slowly moving forward as the front ten were repeatedly served and dismissed. When he reached the head and got the precious mementos, the line behind him was longer than when he started and six deep.

As a whole, the *Jubilee* was a grand success. It has been suggested, and it is probably true, that it was the greatest event of its kind the world has ever known. With such a past, great things will be expected of Leipsic in the future. As to the realization of these expectations, those who know her best will have the least fear. *Long live Leipsic.*

4425 Park Heights Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

¹⁹ Friedberg, p. 54.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL REFORM.

BY REV. JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, D.D., LL.D.

One of the practical questions of the hour is the relation of the Church to social, economic, civic and governmental efforts for the amelioration of bad conditions and for the uplift and well-being of the masses. That Christianity concerns itself, first of all, with the soul and with the spiritual side is no reason why it should not seek the good of the whole man and his betterment in all the spheres and relations of life. This it does primarily in that the greater includes the less, and it does it indirectly in that when men's ideals are changed or when right principles are inculcated, the leaven tends to spread through all the series of social strata until the whole is leavened.

There remains the question, however, in how far it is correct, judicious and safe for the Church, as an organization, directly to ally itself with distinctively ethical, humanitarian and reformatory movements as such. Social reformers are insistent that the Church should take direct part in these propaganda, that the pulpit should make them its theme, and that all the forces of the Christian organization should be thrown into the arena. The contention is that the Church is losing a large opportunity for usefulness, and also declining in influence with the masses, whereas a contrary policy would win over to her great numbers who now remain aloof, and vastly accelerate her own growth.

The demand is also made that in the curriculum of our theological seminaries less time be given to such studies as Biblical Exegesis, Church History, Systematic Theology, etc., and that a larger sphere be allotted to the practical concerns of every-day living. We should have more chairs for the investigation of topics suggested by Modern Sociology, and the studies of students should more profitably be directed along sociological lines. It is charged that our theological seminaries are doing little, if anything, to equip ministers for the task of reaching the man

with the dinner pail, of bridging over the chasm between the Church and labor.

The question is a vital one, and, as bearing on the legitimate scope of the Church's agency, and also on the favorable or unfavorable estimate held of her by the public at large, should be carefully considered and wisely and decisively answered by every conscientious minister.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIOLOGY.

The manner in which our Lord met these questions, as far as they confronted Him, is, for the student of practical Christianity, of the first importance. Having not Himself whereon to lay His head, and traversing on foot the fields and thoroughfares where He encountered the toiling masses, with His quick and sensitive sympathy He bore all their burdens upon His heart. No burden is more oppressive than that of political bondage. "No yoke," says Macaulay, "is so galling as that of the foreigner." Christ found His countrymen suffering under this well-nigh intolerable yoke, and a great revulsion in the popular feeling toward Him ensued when He declined to interfere.

All that He was willing to do in the premises was to lay down the cardinal guiding principle, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."¹ One of the most fruitful causes of wrong in human society is the mal-administration of justice. One such aggrieved party came to our Lord as the imagined adjudicator of all rights, with a request that He intervene. But His only response was, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?"² Yet, who has done so much to subvert the yoke of the oppressor, and to vindicate to nations the right of self-government, and who has so advanced the equal-handed administration of justice between strong and weak, rich and poor, as has the great Teacher?

It was not that He did not smart under the sense of pain for social wrongs and injustices, but that He felt that by embroiling Himself in battle with them He was drawn apart from the supreme mission for which He came, as a spiritual Prophet, to

¹ *Mark* xii. 17.

² *Luke* xii. 14.

bear witness to the Truth, and that thereby this wider and greater sway over the well-being of mankind would be weakened. And history has vindicated His far-seeing wisdom and His well-poised judgment.

Thus says Luthardt: "Christianity introduced the era of humanity—of the rights of man. It made no changes in the external arrangements of society; it left laws and privileges, manners and conditions, customs and ranks as it found them; but it introduced a new spirit into all these relations of life. It did not even externally abolish slavery; but it taught all to recognize in the slave a man, a Christian brother, and thus gave an internal blow to this objectionable institution. It raised the condition of women from a degraded to a most honorable and influential one. It made love,—which, as Montesquieu said, at the time of its introduction, still bore only a form which cannot be named,—the noblest and tenderest power of mental and spiritual life. It withdrew children, whom the heathen world had felt no scruple at destroying either before or after birth, from the arbitrary power of their parents as mere property, and placed them under the Saviour's protection by declaring them to be by baptism children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven."³

RELIGION THE CHURCH'S AGENCY OF REFORM.

The same lesson is taught the Church by a study of the course pursued by the primitive fathers. The social situation confronting them was desperate. The masses were regarded as without souls. Three-fourths of human beings were slaves, with their lives at the caprice of their masters. There was no regard for human life. Augustus sacrificed the lives of three thousand men in a sea-fight to delight the blunted moral sense of the citizens. Vices that hide from moral view, unblushingly looked out from the decorations and statuary of the palaces and public baths, as revealed in the unearthed cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii. It was almost time, one feels like saying, that such repulsive horrors should be covered by the terrible agency of the volcano. The "social evil" was universal. Plato advocated a

³ "Fundamental Truths of Christianity," Lecture X.

community of wives. So deplorable was the prevalent immorality that even the Roman moralist, Seneca, wrote: "Everything is full of vices and crimes. There is a great struggle who shall exceed in turpitude. Day by day the love of sin increases and shame diminishes."⁴ And the satirist, Juvenal, exclaims: "Truly the present is a ninth age of the world, far worse than the iron age, and one to express whose badness nature herself can furnish no name, and has produced no metal."⁵

And what, now, were the means taken by the apostolic fathers and spiritual leaders of this age to redress these shocking evils and to save society from this awful abyss of sin, vice and misery? They simply held up Christ. They preached the gospel. They called men to repentance and faith. They urged all to become believers. They insisted on Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They declared that regeneration, through the means of grace, was the only hope of the reformation of society. They held to the power of their message to cure these vile conditions and to pour the streams of cleansing, purifying life through all the bogs and quagmires of moral corruption.

In short, their practice reveals their conviction that religion, mediated by the Church, was society's only hope. And the more desperate the social conditions, the more definitely and positively they held the Church to her supreme function. And it is not to be doubted that in this course they were guided by a wisdom not their own. They were led by the Holy Ghost.

That a reaction from the modern tendency to make the Church chiefly a social reform bureau is beginning to appear, is shown by these recent words from the eminent thinker at the head of Princeton University, President Woodrow Wilson:

"I believe that we have erroneously conceived the sphere of the Christian Church in our age. If my observation does not mislead me, the Christian Church nowadays is tempted to be regarded as chiefly a philanthropic institution, chiefly an instrument that shall supply the spiritual impulse which is necessary for carrying on those great enterprises which relieve the distress of body and distress of mind, which so disturbs the world and so excites our pity, among those men particularly who

⁴ Luthardt's "Moral Truths of Christianity," p. 345.

⁵ *Ibid.*

have not had the advantages of fortune or of economic opportunity. And yet I believe this is only a very small part of the business of the Church. The business of the Church is not to pity men. No man who has recovered the integrity of his soul is any longer the object of pity, and it is to enable him to recover that lost integrity that the Christian Church is organized."

What the minister has to do is to reveal God to men, reveal God to them in their own spirits, reveal God to them in thought and in action, re-establish the spiritual kingdom among us, by proclaiming in season and out of season that there is no explanation for anything that is not first or last a spiritual explanation, and that man cannot live by bread alone.

And this conservative, far-seeing sagacity, this strength with patience, this faith in her spiritual weapons, has characterized the Church of Christ in every age.

The first mission of the Church is spiritual. Her work is to reconstruct the moral nature. She is to awaken the soul from its death in trespasses and sins. She is to be the interpreter of Religion. She is to point men to the higher life. She is to preach to them the Word of God. She is to recreate them by the power of the Holy Ghost. She is to build them up in the image of Jesus Christ. Whatever may be her secondary activity, this spiritual and religious mission must ever be her supreme aim.

THE GOSPEL THE CHIEF MEANS OF REFORM.

Social reform needs reinforcement just at this point. It is not enough to clean up the slums, to build school-houses with play-grounds, to appoint boards of arbitration. All these and countless other reforms are necessary and invaluable. But if they ignore God, what promise is there in them of a complete social evolution? In addition to reform men need to feel that there is something more powerful making for social peace than even better men in a new environment. That something is God. "To make a Church a religious mixture of civil service reform, debating societies, gymnasiums, suppers, concerts, stereopticon lectures, good advice, refined negro minstrel shows and dramatic entertainments, is to bring it into competition with the variety

theatre. And when the masses have to choose between that sort of church and its rival, if they have any sense left within their perplexed heads, they will choose the society theatre. That, at least, is performing its proper social function."⁶ The "up-to-date" minister prides himself in having his hands in everything. Paul said: "This one thing I do." He was all-absorbed in his "high-calling in Christ Jesus." Such a minister gains in dignity and spiritual power far more than he loses by "leaving the Word of God to serve tables" with every propaganda labeled Social Reform. The Church must educate its members in the principles governing social conduct by bringing their lives into vital relationship with God, and then it must leave them to act freely on political or social questions as their judgment may dictate,

And while she has had to bear many reproaches for it, and has lost much superficial applause, there is no doubt that she has thereby achieved incalculably vaster results for the well-being and progress of the race. One by one she has seen the various forms of social injustice weaken and disappear, until, under the influence of her teaching and communion, the worst evils that have darkened the course of human history are now relegated to a forgotten past, or exist but as a by-word and memorial of warning.

For example, the Church as a whole in America was indignantly held to answer because it would not join many of the New England churches in an open campaign against slavery. But the Church felt that, inasmuch as slavery had a quasi-recognition in the Constitution and was held by a large body of citizens to be a political question, it was so involved with existing policies and social conditions that it was beyond its sphere directly to attack it. It assumed that the least harmful and the most thorough method to overthrow what was an undoubted evil was by turning upon it the light of gospel liberty, and asserting those generic Biblical teachings of human brotherhood, under the force of which it must inevitably disappear. And we think the dispassionate judgment of history approves the Church's long-suffering wisdom in that acute crisis.

⁶ "The Church and the Changing Order," Prof. Shailer Matthews, p. 158.

In these lessons of history the Church can find her guiding principles for the present age with respect to the various phases of Social Reform. Take, for example, the relation of the organized Church to organized labor. Here is a statement of labor's demands by a leading representative: "The wage workers, seeing no interest, or but little interest, manifested in the Church in the human side of a religious question, or in the question of bread and butter and a decent living, have naturally drifted away from the Church to a great extent; and I am constrained to believe that they are not going back in large numbers until the Church will emphasize just as strongly the human side of the religion of Jesus Christ as it does the spiritual side."

Were the Church to yield to such an insistence, she would have to reconstruct her organization fundamentally. And such a revolutionary policy would, in the end, overthrow that power which, exerted in accord with her primary character, has been the means of removing so many a yoke from the neck of labor, and elevating the laboring classes to a position of dignity and comparative equality of opportunity such as they had never known but for her potent, beneficial influence. The Rev. Dr. D. J. Burrell, as reported in its Homiletic Review, speaks thus for himself and Dr. Spurgeon on this point. "I utterly hate sensationalism. There are no concerts in this church. We eschew every hurdy-gurdy. We use no stereopticon. There is no attempt to win attention by preaching on marriage, on politics, or on *outre* themes. I wish the people to understand that when they come here they will listen to the best preaching that I have the ability to give them on the old gospel lines. The one thing which more than anything else has influenced my ministerial life was a sentence from C. H. Spurgeon. I heard him in his own pulpit say, 'O! I do love to preach the old gospel of my Lord and Savior. The committee on a reform movement came to see me to ask if I would speak at Exeter Hall, but I replied that I would not do it. I am a preacher of the unsearchable riches of Christ. Any blind fiddler could do that kind of work, but I am a preacher.'"

THE CHURCH PRIMARILY A SPIRITUAL TEACHER.

And so, when we are told that we must make the Christian re-

ligion less divine and more human, less spiritual and more social, rather an elaborate organization for social service than a kingdom of God, simply "a union of those who love for the service of those who suffer," and disencumber the Church of the word and sacrament, of creed and confession, of faith and worship, of the agency and power of the Holy Spirit, and of calling men first of all "not to live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," let us be on our guard.

When Christianity surrenders these, her Samson locks, at the behest of superficial social reformers, she will be false to her high and unique calling as the spiritual teacher of mankind, and she will be shorn of her reformatory power. The Church, as the visible organization of the kingdom of God—the communion of saints—can only do her ordained work in her own way, and by fidelity to her historic conservatism.

As an illustration of the effectiveness of this method, of the Church not entangling herself with compromising alliances with secularistic, social and ethical reform movements, or resorts to legal authority, Kurtz, in his "Church History," has this significant note: "The three inveterate moral plagues of the ancient world, contempt of foreign nationalities, degradation of women, and slavery, were overcome, according to Gal. iii. 28, ('For ye are all one in Christ Jesus,') by gradual elevation of inward feelings, without any violent struggle against existing laws and customs, and the consciousness of common membership in the one head in heaven, hallowed all the relationships of the earthly life."⁷

The Church is not a sociological lectureship. One of the chief reasons why the social influence of the pulpit is not greater among the masses is undoubtedly the fact, that in its zeal to get in touch with the masses it has been nagged into undertaking every sort of reform.

But, in the same proportion as the Church has been diverted from her peculiar field, has she lost not only her religious, but her general social influence. She must, therefore, in self-protection, sternly object to making religion a mere instrument for the furthering of a propaganda which is purely secular. All these efforts to induce the Church to make herself an appendage

⁷ Val. I., pp. 63, 64.

for the advancement of social reform in any of its phases is but another way of saying that she shall be secularized.

No disciple of Jesus is true to his divine Master whose heart does not thrill in response to the cries of humanity suffering from wrongs and vices. And no Church is true to its intent that is not awake to the importance of the various benevolent causes and reformatory movements, inspired by the laudable purpose to aid, help and relieve the needy and downtrodden. Ministers must not merely preach, but engage in a personal ministry of mercy. Laymen must not merely profess religion, but practice it in active lives as co-laborers in every good cause in human behalf. But all this can be most efficiently done without compromising the Church as the instrument of religion and the congregation of believers.

New York City.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE CHURCH AND THE COLLEGE.*

BY REV. PROFESSOR JOHN A. W. HAAS, D.D.

In a very interesting address before the Educational Conference of the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church, President Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching, has discussed the relation of the Christian denominations to the colleges. This address, appearing in the *Educational Review*, published by the Carnegie Foundation, and commented upon by such a journal as *The Nation*, deserves more than passing notice on the part of all devoted to the denominational college.

In its purpose of advancing teaching and raising the standard of education, the Carnegie Foundation, which does not aid strictly denominational colleges, has been compelled to state why it passes by the church colleges. The elimination of the church college from the approved list has necessarily led to a discussion of the denominational college.

The first position which may be taken by a denomination toward the college is thus stated by President Pritchett: "A church may frankly say that, in order to carry out its legitimate work and advance its cause, it must control and direct a certain number of institutions of higher learning in which men may grow up trained in its ideals and devoted to its service." The motives which lie back of this are described as the strong desire to propagate the faith for which the denomination stands, and to train denominational leaders. But it is questioned whether what the Church could do formerly it can accomplish at the present through general education. The cause of the Church has been weakened because it has been induced to aid colleges by adopting institutions that sought the Church to gain a constituency. Education, it is further claimed, ought not to be at present a

*Reprinted by permission from the *Educational Review*, New York, October 1909. Copyright 1909, by Educational Review Publishing Co.

great work of the Church, nor one of the agencies to which it should direct its energy.

In the whole discussion summed up in these leading thoughts, it is supposed that the denominational motive is all-controlling, and that a denominational college exists largely only for its specific church. President Pritchett believes that the average American citizen of religious life and religious aspirations is not wholly in sympathy with such a church college, but it is not sufficiently recognized that the denominational college has been influenced by a wide ideal, and that it combines its historic denominational connection with its larger educational purpose.

It is true that the statement is made: "The wish to bring religious influence into college life is also one which has played a part in inducing organized bodies of Christians to undertake the control and support of colleges. How far this motive has had influence, it is difficult to say." But over against this partial admission, denominational rivalry is made a much larger element than the motive of religious education, and in this assertion full justice is not done to the controlling religious ideal of the denominational college. The weakness of the denominational college is shown in a stronger light than its ruling purpose. No doubt the lack of a true appreciation of just what Christian education is, and what in various ways the church college is doing for Christian education, is responsible for this whole attitude. It is assumed that Christian education in its highest and broadest form is found outside of the church college. And as a basis for the claim that Christian education can be carried on without the medium of a church college, President Pritchett attempts the following definition of Christian education:

"Much confusion has heretofore existed as to just what is meant by Christian education—a confusion which arises partly out of the almost universal failure to discriminate between religion and church membership, and partly out of a lack of appreciation of the intellectual strivings of the college and university student.

"The essentials of religion are the same whether men belong to one religious organization or another. Religion is a life springing up in the human soul which blossoms into forgetful-

ness of self in the service of God and men. This life exists without any reference to the denominational or ecclesiastical definition of it. It has, in fact, to this formal expression much the same relation that the stars have to the science of astronomy, or that the flowers have to botany, or that the chemical reactions have to the text-books in chemistry. Now shall Christian education mean the effort to bring into the minds and into the lives of students the conception of religion as a life, or shall it mean the presentation of the forms of worship of a particular denomination and the claims of a particular view of truth? And shall the methods by which these elemental relations are to be brought to the attention of college boys be those of the congregation, of the Sunday School, of the revival, or shall they take account of the intellectual processes through which the student is developing? Shall they be planned to appeal more directly to the emotions or to the reason?"

In the endeavor to draw a distinction between religion and church membership, an unreal separation is effected. For the life of religion—and religion here means concretely the Christian religion—has been carried on and perpetuated by the agency of the Church, despite her weakness and aberrations. It is the Church and her leaders that have stood for religious ideals which have stimulated others to accept them. It is the Church which has handed down the Bible, and through whose activity religion has been advanced in the world. Consequently, it is an unhistorical and academic distinction which practically tears apart religion and church membership. It is true that outward church membership of itself is no guarantee of religion, but the non-appreciation of what the Church offers is no proof that she is not the purveyor of religion, and that consequently church membership is not a help in the religious life.

Again, the conception of the essentials of religion, as independent of religious organization, is misleading. It rests, perhaps unconsciously, on the idea that the religious fundamentals live on, apart from, and without a religious organization. The historical fact is, that only through definite Christian bodies have the essentials been handed down, and the thought of an existence of them as separate from the actual life of any individual organization, is an academic construction. In the question of

essentials, it is generally the mistaken attitude of to-day to decide upon them by taking the minimum of truth and by making a wide generalization to include as many churches as possible: The real method ought rather to be to determine what the original sources and documents contain, and how these have been historically appropriated. This will result in a much larger body of essentials than is found by the method of reducing them to suit the men whose Christianity is so emaciated that it is almost nothing but theism. Most churches hold to a much larger and fuller conception of religious essentials than simply the idea of God and the moral excellence of Jesus, which is about all that is impressed upon men in the undenominational institution, if there be any direct reference made in the teaching of the college. Therefore it is not the actual statement of the case to speak of the sameness of religious essentials when application is made to all colleges.

Religion is defined as "a life springing up in the human soul which blossoms into forgetfulness of self in the service of God and men," and is supposed to exist without reference to the denominational attitude. This definition is an unpsychological and unhistorical assertion. Religion is assumed to be a life which is purely activity, for I take it that self-forgetfulness is regarded as the way towards service, so that essentially religion is service. Now it is true that action is the end of life, but behind action lie ideas, feelings, motives. And so wherever we may place the main accent in our analysis of religion, if it be regarded in its psychological reality, it must have thoughts as well as feelings, motives as well as attitudes. How can I forget self in the service of God and man without some definite thought as to what God and man is? Why should I serve and how can I best serve? Must these necessary questions not lead back to some ideals of the intellect? Does not the man who makes religion service unconsciously presuppose intellectual convictions? No matter how few may be the creedal elements of my Christian life, they can never be absent. There is no religion without conviction, and conviction implies some relation to the truth, not simply as feeling or willing, but also as intellectual apprehension. Christ, through whom, as reported by John, the thought of religion as life, has actually come to us, combines with the em-

phasis of life, truth. He claims to be the way, the truth, and the life. He is not life simply as service apart from truth. Consequently, when we take the conception of religion as life, which we owe to Christ, it is well to know what He said such life was. And it is in the appropriation of Christ, and in consonance with the experience of what He is to man as an individual and for the race, that close thinkers have felt it necessary to combine truth with life. Because, therefore, truth is a part of the religious life, and because this truth has taken shape and come to historical expression in the various denominations, they stand for the necessity of some definite teaching and truth. It is purely an assumption to say that this life exists apart from denominational definition. Denominational definition may emphasize certain aspects of it, may even misinterpret certain parts of it; but, nevertheless, this life, as truth for the intellect, as truth for the highest emotions, as truth for the noblest service, is actually carried on and forwarded through the agency of the various denominations. If, therefore, there is a value in religion for education, and if, despite their variations, the denominations are the bearers of this life, then they can best undertake religious education.

It is a mistake to suppose that the denominational college lives religiously to present forms of worship, methods of conversion, Sunday School instruction, peculiar views of truth, and that its schemes of teaching religion generally contravene the intellectual ideals of the young students, or fail to meet their honest inquiries. While there may be some teachers of religion in the denominational colleges who misinterpret their places, yet most are doing what the undenominational college never does, that is, leading the growing mind into the larger conceptions of religious truth. They are teaching men to put away childish things in their thinking about religion. In the very large college not under religious control, there is mostly not even a required course in ethics. Only incidentally, but not in a systematic way, are the students taught the great moral relations, in duty, virtue, and the highest good. Consequently, many students live under the impression that there is no systematic and harmonious relation in moral facts. It is the average church college which, apart from any religious teaching, is

keeping alive the practice of making men think in their more mature stage of moral questions by direct teaching and discussion. And thus, in the same way, religion is mostly taught in its great problems and implications. Whatever denominational weakness there is does not detract from the fundamental value of religious instruction. The breadth of college teaching generally avoids that, for it usually passes from a delineation of theism to the great historical and religious claims of Christianity. It is the church college which does not allow non-Christian teachers to promulgate views that are subversive of all religion. The cry which was uttered in a meeting of college leaders at the seventy-fifth anniversary of Haverford College by Professor George Wharton Pepper, that men ought not to be allowed to go astray in the highest issues of life for want of guidance, has been answered by the denominational college. It puts before men the great questions, the great duties of the present, and also the great assertions of religion.

Because the denominational college takes this attitude, it can claim what President Pritchett asserts as the second possible position, namely the right of the Church to control the colleges on the ground of "its fitness and efficiency as an educational agency." The educational right of the denominational college rests upon the place which religion has in forming character. If education means simply efficient methods of imparting knowledge, high intellectual standards of scholarship, excellent administration, and if the finality is not character, and if in developing character religion is not most powerful, then the church college has no claim to existence, and the sooner it closes, the more effectively a great waste will be done away with. But if religion is a necessary factor in full and harmonious education, then the denominational college can claim its place in the educational work with strong assurance. The church college has greater religious power because it adds to the free association among young men the definite teaching of religion; its professors stand for something, and they have a motive to present. It is the very absence of a strong religious and moral motive which is being felt in much present-day education. But the denominational college has great opportunity to present the controlling motive because it adds to the usual duties of men the highest

sanction, and hallows all relation to men by man's faith in God.

Furthermore, because religious influence is usually brought to bear upon young men through the teaching of the Bible, the denominational college makes for greater literary efficiency of all its students. It dares to interpret not only the body, but the soul of Biblical history and truth. It does for all its students what is done for some by the general literary course of colleges, in teaching the Bible as literature. But it accomplishes more, in that not simply the linguistic form and the outward content are noted, but the inner power is permitted to have its influence.

In the presentation of religion the denominational college also leads many, who may not take any philosophical course, to consider some of the highest problems of existence, and to adjust laws of nature and postulates of science to the implications of God, immortality, righteousness, and freedom. Many church colleges still retain, even apart from religious instruction, a required philosophical course, so that the student may be led to trace facts back to first principles, and to distinguish in every science between data and inferences. It thus makes clearer and more balanced thinkers. But even when the philosophical course is not obligatory, religious instruction supplies some of the training gained in thinking about great masses of facts from great unifying principles.

There is also in religion a wonderful cultural power. It refines and elevates thoughts, feelings, and will. In such uplift there is none of the danger of mere estheticism, which often fails to make strong men through its cultivation of admiration for beauty alone in literature, fine arts, and music. Religion makes deeply sensitive as well as strongly active men. Because it is thus the most effective cultural power, it fulfils the cultural longings of other specific culture studies. Through it, also, men can understand some of the most wonderful creations of all art, whether in stone, on canvas, or in tone. It is the key to the whole art of the Middle Ages. But as this art is bound up with the life and history of the Middle Ages, there can be no full understanding of this history without a realization of the religious motive. Still less can the dawn of modern history be rightly appreciated in the movement of the Reformation, unless the great intellectual, cultural, economic, social, and political

changes are seen emanating from the upheaval which the religious experience, leading to freedom of conscience, brought about. Consequently, for these reasons and others, which might be named, the education that includes religion furnishes a larger key to unlock the history of the past to explain the present, than the education which neglects this fundamental fact in human life and history.

Now it may be admitted that sometimes there is a departure from the highest ideals and practices in the denominational college. Where are ideals fully carried out? It may also be true that there has at times been a lack of making all the activities and life of the church college consonant with its profession; that there have been sins of omission and commission in methods. In athletics, sins are to be named that obtain in colleges where the Christian motive is not directly emphasized. And if such wrongs are constant, a denominational college has lost its savor and is only worth being cast out and trodden underfoot. But, nevertheless, the failure to realize the ideal is no disproof of the ideal. It is entirely true that there has sometimes crept in a mechanical conception of religious education, and that there has been an educational insincerity in the claims of some denominational colleges. President Pritchett is entirely right when, in this respect, he calls those that are sinners to repentance. It is a shame and a denial of the claim of its fundamental religious attitude for a college to aspire to do what it can not do rather than to be content with the name of academy; and it is equally wrong when a legitimate college inflates itself with the name of university. However, the denominational college has not been the only sinner in this matter. It is also true that sometimes churches have not valued their own institutions, without which their continuance would not have been possible. But to-day greater activity is evident, and equipment is being brought up to modern requirements. It is a mistake, as all admit, when a church has more colleges than it needs. But the mistake, in a very few instances, does not justify the impression that there is a general overlapping.

The third attitude of President Pritchett is that "a Christian organization may take the position that all colleges and universities, being influenced by agents in the training of men, are

also agencies for moral and religious influence, and therefore the Church will seek by friendly co-operation, by sympathetic fellowship, by all the means of Christian activity, to make itself a religious influence in all institutions of the higher learning without assuming their control or support."

A very important condition is touched in this position. Never are all the students of a church in its own institutions. The better it covers the field of general classical training, which is its specific problem, the less can it meet the demands of fullest scientific and technical training. Consequently many of every church will be studying beyond the direct influence of its own teachers. Now to meet this emergency it seems expedient to undertake what some churches have begun; namely, to organize their own students in every general institution. At the head of such organization there ought to be placed men of the highest type, who are in deepest sympathy with college and university ideals, and who present to the young men the truths of religion as best fitted for their stage of development. But this work can only be done best when connected with the centers of certain denominational colleges, which ought to prepare the men for such labor and stimulate to its continuance. While, therefore, a real duty is put before all churches in the last position indicated by President Pritchett, yet the efficiency of this duty will depend upon such denominational leaders as the denominational college alone can develop.

Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

ARTICLE IX.

MELANCHTHON'S LETTER ON LUTHER'S MARRIAGE.

BY PROFESSOR J. ALFRED FAULKNER.

Melanchthon was not only not invited to Luther's marriage, June 13, 1525, but he looked upon it as unseasonable on account of the Peasants' War and other troubles, and as likely to lower the esteem of Luther, the monk. On the 16th, he wrote a letter in Greek to his friend Camerarius, soon to be professor of Greek in the gymnasium in Nuremberg, and later at Tübingen, in which he gives his philosophy of Luther's marriage, attributing it in part to his susceptibility to the charms of female society. This letter has been much exploited by Luther's opponents as reflecting on his character (as, for instance, by Evers, *Luther* V. 516, and Denifle, *Luther and Luthertum*, 2 Aufl. I. 283). It will be interesting, therefore, to see what Melanchthon says. Camerarius published this among other letters of Melanchthon in 1569, but in imperfect form. Wilhelm Meyer, in the winter of 1874-5, was fortunate enough to find the original letter in Rome, restored as far as he could the illegible parts, and published the letter in the Proceedings of the Academy of Science of Munich (phil.-philog.-historical class) 1876, 601-4. Another advance was made by an eminent Catholic scholar, Dr. Peter Anton Kirsch, engaged in researches in Rome, who deciphered the letter more correctly, and published it in *Katholik* 1900, 385 ff. (also a separate edition). Professor Nicholas Müller of Berlin, engaged on a supplementary collection of Melanchthon's letters, made a careful study of the original for himself, and thinks he has been able to present it in more accurate form than even Kirsch has done. This text, as thus finally redintegrated, Müller printed in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* January, 1901, 596-8 (vol. 21). The following translation is made from this text. I agree with Müller that the significance of this "instantaneous outpour of Melanchthon's uneasiness and sensitiveness" has been greatly overrated. How far Melanchthon's explanations avail for this event in Luther's life we shall probably never know, but I am

not inclined to place much store by them. We have Luther's own testimony that in the face of illness and of an early expected death, he deliberately married to lay down a witness before God, men and devils of the honorableness of an estate founded by God himself. The suppositions of the disappointed friend both as to the nuns and Luther might well be taken with some grains of salt, though they do not reflect in any essential way on the character of either. So far as I know, this letter has never appeared in English. There is a German translation with notes in Professor Wilhelm Walther's *Das sechste Gebot und Luther's Leben*, Halle, 1893, 95-9.

To Joachim Camerarius of Bamberg great (summo)friend:

"Greeting. Because perhaps contradictory reports have reached you concerning the marriage of Luther, I write to you how I think concerning it. On the 13th of June Luther married unexpectedly the Bora, without previously laying the matter before his friends. But in the evening after he had invited only Pomeranus, the painter Lucas (Cranach) and Appel to supper, he went through the usual ceremonies. Perhaps you could only wonder that in this unhappy time when all noble and good men are in constant distress, that this one (Luther) does not feel the same, but as it appears, prefers to live softly, (*τρυφᾶν*) and lessen his esteem or reputation, (*αξιωμα*) while Germany needs the most his judgment and his authority. I think, however, the matter has happened in this way. The man (Luther) is very good natured (*εὐχερής*), and the nuns by laying plots for him with all their wiles welcomed him with salutations (*προσέσπασσαν*). Perhaps also much association (*συνήθεα*) with these nuns enervated or even inflamed this noble and great-souled man. So it appears to me he has been persuaded into this untimely change of his state in life. The babbler, however, that before this he had ravished her is a manifest lie. But now that it (the marriage) has happened, we need not take it ill or as a reproach. But I rather believe that by nature we are compelled to marry. This state of life is without glory (*ταπιερός*), but it is holy and more pleasing to God than celibacy. And though I look upon Luther as grieved and confused by this change in his life, yet I will undertake with all zeal and reason to comfort him, as though he had done anything which deserved

reproof or could not be defended. I have indeed positive proofs of his piety (*εὐσέβειας*) so that it is not permitted to condemn him. For I would rather see him humbled than lifted up and exalted, for this is dangerous not only for the priesthood, but also for all men. For things to turn out well gives a pretext for evil thoughts; not only, as the orator says, to the foolish, but also to the wise. Besides this, I hope that this state in life will make him more grave (*σεμνότερον*), so that he will throw away his coarse jesting, (*βωμολοχία*), which I have often found fault with. For a new state in life brings a new mode of life, according to the proverb.

I speak thus at length to you that you may not be too much disturbed by this strange (*παραδίξειν*) event. For I know that you have Luther's honor (*αξιωματος*) at heart and that you would be cast down to see it lessened. I exhort you to bear these things gently, because in the Holy Scriptures marriage is called an honorable life. It is likely that to marry is in truth a necessity. For God has pointed out to us many mistakes (*πταισμάτων*) of the saints of old; so he wills that we, rubbing ourselves against his Word as a touchstone, should make as counsellor not the esteem or face of men but his Word alone. For he is most impious who on account of the mistake (*πταισμά*) of the teacher condemns the teaching.

(The above is in Greek. The last paragraph of the letter is in Latin and refers to other matters).

The custom of Michaelis is very pleasant in these uproars. I admire him whom you suffer to get off with this. By treating the father most courteously, think that you owe this grace to him for paternal love, and cherish him in return. I expect letters from you *de Francicis...* Farewell. After Corpus Christi. Tabellarius, who hands these over, is to return the right things to us.

PHILIP.

Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

ARTICLE X.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

I. IN ENGLISH.

In an article in the August number of the *Homiletic Review* entitled "American Theology as Seen by a Scottish Theologian," Dr. James Orr of Glasgow, speaks of the continued interest in doctrinal theology as shown in the appearance of Dr. Strong's Theology in three large volumes, Dr. W. A. Brown's "Christian Theology in Outline," Dr. W. N. Clarke's "Christian Doctrine of God," and similar works. The last mentioned has excited probably the chief interest, both on account of its felicitous presentation of the subject, and its departure from conservative lines. For instance, it does not mention the pre-existence of Christ.

Probably no single utterance during the last half-year has received wider notice than Dr. Eliot's address on "The Religion of the Future" before the Harvard Summer School of Theology. The full text of the address appears in the October *"Harvard Theological Review."* It is simply a presentation of the old Unitarianism, modified by natural science. The paper bears the mark of hasty preparation and is quite inexact in the use of the word religion. It would have passed unnoticed but for the name of its distinguished author. The New Religion is characterized as follows:

(1) "The religion of the future will not be based on authority, either spiritual or temporal." Neither the Church nor the Bible will be recognized as authoritative. These are purely human.

(2) "There will be no personifications of the primitive forces of nature." Of course not. No civilized land or religion does this now.

(3) "There will be in the religion of the future no worship,

express or implied, of dead ancestors, teachers or rulers." This is a repudiation of our Lord's divinity.

(4) "In the religious life of the future the primary object will not be the personal welfare or safety of the individual in this world or any other * * * but of service to others, and of contributions to the common good."

(5) "The religion of the future will not be propitiatory sacrificial, or expiatory." This is a thrust at the cross of Christ. We do not believe that any religion can live without "the blood." Unitarianism itself is an example of an effete religion.

(6) "The religion of the future will not perpetuate the Hebrew anthropomorphic representations of God. * * It will not think of God as an enlarged man." "The scientific doctrine of one omnipresent, eternal Energy" has evidently inspired Dr. Eliot.

(7) "The religion of the future will not be gloomy, ascetic, or maledictory."

In the positive view of the New Religion Dr. Eliot says many good things. The gist of it, however, is humanitarianism. Having uncrowned our Lord, he says, "Finally, this twentieth-century religion * * * is in essential agreement with the direct, personal teachings of Jesus, as they are reported in the Gospels. The revelation he gave to mankind thus becomes more wonderful than ever."

The October number of the *Harvard Theological Review* presents "some aspects of the religious philosophy of Rudolph Eucken" by Rev. Howard W. Brown, who says:

"In Eucken's philosophy we have mankind once more occupying that central place on the wide stage of the physical creation which ancient poetry and religion assigned to human beings; and we are thereby delivered from that feeling of the littleness and the worthlessness of our life which finds so much sad expression in modern literature. We have this child of Deity, inheritor of the freedom and the creative faculty belonging to the sons of God, set to do battle with oppositions that surround his steps; made to achieve greatness only by stout courage and tireless industry.

"Above all, we have man forced to hard conflict with an in-

ward foe; incapable of peace and rest save as he stands, at least for the moment, victorious over the tempter in his own heart.

"All this may be held to reflect very closely the common consciousness of what life is, and therefore we have reason to say that religion has by no means fallen out of date. Every prophet who only professes to show how God may be man's helper through these ways of difficulty and trial can be sure of some hearing and following, according to the boldness of his promises, though his offer be little more than an empty boast. And when one does really bring the might of the Spirit to their aid, mankind will be almost ready to worship him as if he were a god."

In the October-November number of the *Union Seminary Magazine* of Richmond, Va., Dr. H. E. Kirk discusses Pragmatism, of which Prof. William James of Harvard is the American exponent. Pragmatism professes to show how to separate the necessary modicum of truth from the debris of speculation. It tests all theories by their practical consequences. Do such views help or hinder life? If they help they are true for you; if they hinder then they are false. The master-word of pragmatism is: *truth is what works.*

The question of man's nature is a vital one. Is he spiritual or material? Upon examination the materialistic program offers no promise; it issues on the contrary in ruin, disaster and death—a tragedy. The theistic view on the other hand is full of promise. It offers a future of hope, of everlasting life, a spiritual millenium; therefore the pragmatist decides for the theistic view on utilitarian grounds.

In the October number of *The Reformed Church Review* Dr. William C. Schaeffer discusses "The Rights and Limits of Biblical Criticism." The rights of the textual critic "are as full as the evidence of his manuscript goes. * * * He is limited to the determination of the text. When this is accomplished his mission is at an end." "The higher criticism is simply a method of study; its aim is to ascertain all that can be known with reference to the origin, the history and the authenticity, the character and the original meaning of a writing." "The higher critics are strictly within their rights so long as they con-

fine themselves to the literary and historical study of the Gospels without prejudices or prepossessions which may warp their conclusions." The limitations of the critics are "the legitimate methods of literary and historical investigation," "the intellectual equipment of the critic," "undoubted facts on which to base conclusions," and "the ability of the critic to judge." "All depends on the man, on his character, his equipment, and his judgment."

The Hibbert Journal for October has an illuminating article on "Modernism : A Retrospect and a Prospect," by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A. The rise of modernism in the Catholic Church is attributed to Pope Leo XIII, who, though not a liberal, was scholarly and saw the necessity of throwing open the Vatican library to students. He made overtures to the Liberals, and encouraged historical research. An ecclesiastic, and a man rather of letters than of learning, he did not really understand the liberal standpoint or see how wide a departure from the tradition it involved. When it became evident that things were going further than he had thought, he was puzzled, and temporized, and left the decision to his successor. For Modernism and Modernists with the death of Leo XIII (1903) the deluge came. In modern thought, in modern life, in modern society, Pius X. saw the uprising of the world against the Church, of the laymen against the priest—a rebellion against the theocracy. In July, 1907, the decree condemning sixty-five propositions of Modernism was published. And what is the end going to be? "The Papacy is, and will be for long, a force in politics. It can command votes, it can effect combinations, it impresses the imagination; it bulks large before the world. But it is a declining power. The stars in their courses fight against it; the forces which are making history are on the other side. Silently, ceaselessly they work. Like a majestic iceberg detached from some Arctic continent, it moves southward from the Polar Ocean, a fragment of a dead world. Ghostlike, a peril to mariners, it towers over the waters that wash its base: its peaks glitter in the sunlight; its cliffs reflect the blue of sea and sky. And while the process of undermining is going on, the frozen mass encount-

ers kindlier currents; the temperature rises; a little sooner, a little later it may be, there can be but one end."

In the same journal Prof. Browne writes of "Darwin and Darwinism." He gives Darwin credit for patient and careful investigation. Darwin's contribution to evolutionary thought was his doctrine of "the origin of species through natural selection." Concerning this Prof. Browne declares that whatever may be true of the doctrine of natural descent, natural selection in its original form is obsolescent and largely obsolete.

"Does the Historical Study of Religions Yield a Dogmatic Theology?" is the question which Prof. Hugh R. Mackintosh of Edinburg, asks in the October, *American Journal of Theology*. The science of comparative theology is proposing to take over the business of Christian theology. It is making great claims. By laying down certain canons of criticism and by ignoring certain great facts pertaining to Christianity and assuming as true unproved propositions, it makes Christianity appear a syncretism. Prof. Mackintosh after examining the claims of this historic study of religion from the three points of view—criticism, analogy and relativity—pronounces the result to be of a negative and unsatisfactory character. The service of exegesis may be freely acknowledged, but to Christian theology it is useless. "For there is no evading the principle laid down by the instinctive feeling of the Church: unless a theologian takes the specifically Christian attitude to Jesus—unless with the saints of every time he puts Jesus in the supreme place, a place that covers and determines everything in the relations of God and man—he is not a Christian theologian any more. That which he is building up is not Christianity, but something quite different. It is the outcome of an attempt to make all over again a religion that has passed its nineteen-hundredth birthday."

In an article on "Evolution and Sin," by D. C. Knowles, in the November *Methodist Review*, Dr. Clarke's position as taken in his "Doctrine of God," is called in question. Dr. Clarke is a theistic evolutionist, who believes that not only the human body but also the soul has come up through a long process of de-

velopment. Mr. Knowles characterizes Dr. Clarke's view as "modern heathenism double-distilled!" and as "making God a partner in the introduction of sin." "Man is represented as fresh from the hand of his Creator, 'barely human' submerged in the cesspool of animalism, and slowly emerging from the sewage of the ages with a soul so tainted with the brutal experiences of the past that he can scarcely discern a glimmering of God's will." "The issue resolves itself into this: Did God create man by an evolutionary process, as degraded as herein represented, or did man by disobedience produce his condition? * * On what ground does Dr. Clarke assert such a philosophy of origins? At the dictum of an unproved scientific hypothesis, one so imperfect that its own advocates cannot agree how it all came to pass. Its history is a repetition of the biblical history of the Tower of Babel." The evolutionary hypothesis in regard to sin is contradicted by the universal traditions of mankind. History predicates a golden age in the past. Evolutionary degeneracy is better established than evolutionary progress. Moreover, the latter is clearly contradicted by the biblical study of the creation and the whole trend of Scripture.

The Princeton Theological Review for October is a Calvin number, containing but two articles, the one on "Music in the Work of Calvin" and the other on "Calvin's Doctrine of the Trinity." The latter by Dr. B. B. Warfield, covers one hundred pages and seems to leave nothing unsaid on the subject. The claim that Calvin contributed anything essential to the doctrine of the Trinity must be taken, it seems to us, with hesitation.

The Review and Expositor for October publishes a fine article from the pen of Prof. David Foster Estes, D.D., entitled "Some Thoughts as to the Effects of the Death of Christ." He starts out by controverting Dean Farrar's declaration that the language of Article iii. of the Augsburg Confession, "He suffered, was crucified, dead and buried *to reconcile the Father unto us*" is not the language of Scripture. Dr. Estes insists that this is the language of Scripture, that Greek word *καταλλάσσειν* is exactly equivalent to the English word "reconcile," and that the Greek word indicates: first, a change, not of temper, but of relation,

and second, that in Greek unlike the English the person who is made grammatically the object of the verb in the active and its subject in the passive, is not the one who changes but the one in whose favor the change is made. This position is substantiated by citations from the classics, from lexicographers, from the greatest commentators and from the best writers on New Testament Theology. The author then cogently and powerfully sets forth the old orthodox doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the world, and shows that this alone satisfies the human soul filling it with joy in life and with comfort in the hour of death.

II. IN GERMAN.

BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.

In selecting from the host of German theological publications it is to be the purpose of these reports to announce the most noteworthy appearances irrespective of party, and to reproduce such a sketch of current thought as shall serve to indicate the results achieved and the lines pursued by the investigators.

During the five years that have elapsed since German theological thought has been reported on these pages there has been a steady change in the array of forces upon the field. New problems have arisen, some of the old have fallen into the background. There has been no cataclysmic transition, no Strauss, no Baur, no Delitsch, no Harnack, to startle the entire theological world and precipitate a "controversy." If there has been anything of such momentous importance it has been more on the order of a Hofmann or a Ritschl and its significance will appear only after a while. And yet the lines of investigation have gradually experienced a slight shift. Old and tried powers have been called from the field either by a venerable old age or by death itself. And the necrology of the last quinquennium contains a number of familiar names: Köberle, Stade, Beyschlag, Pfleiderer, Wrede, Stöcker, Cremer, Gottschick, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Zöckler, *et al.* But new powers have arisen to take their places, for the atmosphere continues quick with eager questionings. A few strokes must serve for the present to character-

ize in a very general way the thought-life of Germany. This outline may be developed in later issues to a more detailed depiction of the situation. But straws may show which way the wind blows.

The first decade of the twentieth century has witnessed a number of interesting and significant tendencies. We are on the morning side of midnight and many are the streaks of dawn heralding the advent of a new day. The collapse of theoretical materialism is complete. Realism has increasingly assumed an idealistic, romantic hue. The tendency towards mysticism and metaphysics grows steadily and constantly stronger. The pessimistic conception of reality is still wide-spread, but it begins to issue in optimistic hopes for the future. The reign of naturalism has served to emphasize the impotence of man in his sinful bondage to nature. Socialism has dealt mighty blows to radical individualism and the idea of ethical and aesthetic self-redemption no longer predominates.

The absolute rule of the natural sciences is broken; the independence and inalienable rights of the mental sciences receive wider and wider recognition. Among the speculative sciences large interest attaches to the task of determining exactly the essence of the historical method and its legitimate sphere. The relativity of historical truth must be admitted. The most positivistic must recognize the inevitableness of the personal equation in all investigation. Philosophy has gradually recovered from the fall which Hegel had prepared for it and has taken its place again among the sciences. Its attention is now quite naturally directed along epistemological lines. The grounds of scientific knowing must be determined for the individual sciences. And the right of an inductive critical metaphysics numbers among its adherents a large and growing circle of the ablest thinkers. However, it cannot be denied that neokantianism and positivism continue to hold a large place and various gradations of influence in German philosophical thought.

With reference to the specifically religious elements in German thought-life we may affirm a decided advance. Such a trumpet call to the defence of religion as Schliermacher sounded at the beginning of the previous century is not needed now. Far more does Germany need a mighty plea for the *Christian*

religion and more especially for the Church. For those very elements of religion for which Schliermacher in his day pleaded so earnestly are the most characteristic elements in the religious life of thinking classes to-day. And this, even if it is only a mystic pantheism often verging into the aesthetic—the artful cultivation of personality,—nevertheless marks an advance. That unbounded animosity and frivolous scorn which were so liberally measured out to religion by all classes of society several decades ago are decidedly on the decline in the mental atmosphere of the present. This general reversion to religiosity manifests as yet a strong antipathy to every combination with the dogmatic, historical, or ecclesiastical, but in contrast with the recent past it is a pleasing appearance and may be taken to be a preliminary step towards a specifically Christian awakening. What the net benefit to the Church will be remains to be seen. It depends upon whether the Church will be able to rouse herself to new strength and draw into her path this general revival of interest in things religious. Meanwhile she manifests increased activity in her efforts to deepen faith and propagate the works of love.

We hope in later issues to amplify this hurried sketch of the signs of the times in Germany and to show the aims and standing of the different theological schools. From this very general characterization of the situation we pass to the notice of a few of the most important recent publications.

In the chief discipline of systematic theology there is no recent complete presentation of dogmatics to announce. The new edition of Kaftan manifests no noteworthy change of position. The largest measure of attention in this department is being devoted to a discussion of the principles and presuppositions of Christian theology. And in this discussion the representatives of positive theology have been unusually active. Indeed it is one of the marks of the day that the conservative theologians are so productive not only in polemics against the left, but more especially in positive constructive work on the right. And in the investigation of the prolegomena they have participated actively and have been prolific of achievements. It no longer suffices simply to assert that the objective Scriptures constitute the *principium cognoscendi* and with this as the leading and only prin-

iple to develop the dogmatic system. The authority of Scripture must be examined and its relation to the subjective must be ascertained. In short the source or sources of the materials for dogmatics must be determined. And work at the sources often changes the course of the stream.

As the theologians inclining towards the subjectivism of Erlangen have gradually learned to give proper emphasis also to the objective facts of revelation, so those inclining towards the biblicalism of a Beck are forced to recognize the subjective element as essential in establishing genuine evangelical faith in Scripture. As a type of this latter case, holding a position which promises to make possible a union of positive forces on this question, we may quote Schräder, *Schriftglaube und Heilsgewissheit*. Taking as his point of departure the consciousness of personal fellowship with the living God in faith, he makes his way to a judgment concerning Scripture. It is the undeniable historical element in our assurance of salvation, says he, which leads us to Scripture. Our faith as Christians leads us to faith in Scripture. And this it cannot fail to do. "Every theological treatment of Scripture which starts from faith grounded in the assurance of salvation *must* end with the idea of inspiration, with the confession of the inspiration of the Bible." As a type of the former class we have the brochure of Ihmels, *Das Verhältnis der Dogmatik zur Schriftwissenschaft*. He comes to the conclusion: "It is rather the Scripture in the strictest sense which in the name of revelation furnishes the material for dogmatics. And just in the same manner in which all new knowledge is in each instance made to harmonize with the central statement of faith, so here the matter of prime importance is that the impression be made secure, that faith *necessarily* clings to the witness of the Scriptures as it does, and fixes their content as it does." Meanwhile Ihmels' larger work, *Die Christliche Wahrheitsgewissheit*, has appeared in a second, a much enlarged edition. The thetical part has been revised but the theological position (*vide LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, vol. xxxii, p. 281 sqq.) has not changed. The historical part has grown considerably by the addition of a long chapter on the religio-historical school. The criticism of Hermann has become sharper. The author's difference with Frank is more clearly defined than before. It amounts to this

that while Frank emphasizes rather the ethical effects produced by the objective factors in salvation and comprised under the head of regeneration, Ihmels lays greater stress upon the religious effects as they are comprehended in the idea of justifying faith.

Another effort to define the relation between the subjective and objective as sources for theological statement is to be found in two publications of R. Seeberg's. The one, an essay entitled *Der evangelische Glaube und die Tatsachen der Heilsgeschichte* (in his volume of essays, *zur dogmatischen Frage*, 1909), asserts a reciprocal dependence of faith upon the facts of history. "Our faith establishes for us the reality of the saving facts of history but at the same time our faith itself is grounded upon those facts." For faith is brought about through the personal influence upon the soul, but this takes place only through historical ideas, through the account of transpired events together with a judgment concerning them. The other, a booklet entitled *Offenbarung und Inspiration (Zeit und Streitfragen iv. 7 u. 8)*, investigates the essence and the genesis of historical revelation. He shows first "why not only theology but also the Church has given up the old idea of verbal inspiration." Revelation is defined as "the sum of all deeds and effects wrought by God which lead men to salvation and the knowledge of salvation." The Scriptures are defined as "the literary monument which informs us of these deeds and of this knowledge. They constitute a special effect of revelation. Revelation is thus a more inclusive term. But since the Scriptures as the literary deposit and permanent record of the history of revelation constitute an integral part of that history they are also indirectly themselves revelation." Inspiration is then defined as the "influence of the Holy Spirit to the understanding of the given facts of revelation." That is to say, inspiration is the process and influence which gives the content of revelation its correct and permanently dynamic form. Seeberg describes in conclusion the charism of inspiration by the analogy of the Bible charisms.

Prominent also among the publications along the lines of systematic theology are the treatises in apologetics. Especially marked is the effort of the Conservatives to come to an understanding among themselves so as to present a united front

against the Liberals, anti-churchism, irreligion and infidelity. Thus while those on the left contribute to the Problems of Life, those on the right issue their Problems of Eternity. While the more liberal Ritschians and the advocates of the theology of historical religion publish the Popular Tracts of the History of Religion, the Conservatives parry with Biblical Questions of Present-day Controversy. And Bousset's *Theologische Rundschau* now finds its positive counterpart in Grützmacher's *Theologie der Gegenwart*. Positive construction is the strongest apologetic against negative criticism. And the Conservatives are coming to realize this and to change their apologetic tactics from the purely polemical to the firm building up of their own view-point, from negation to position. As proof of this change in tactics we may call attention to three recent works, *Probleme und Aufgaben der gegenwärtigen systematischen Theologie*, by Hunzinger, contains some excellent chapters on the absolute-ness of Christianity, the philosophy of religion in the Church's theology, and the outlines for an apologetic. The proper relation between the Christian conception of the universe and the natural sciences is illumined. And quite deftly does Hunzinger epitomize the Christian conception of the universe in the sense: "God as absolute spiritual personality is the absolute Reality; the world as the means for the accomplishment of God's purpose is dependent, passive and relative reality; redeemed man as progressive religious moral personality is the unfolding reality in God." Pastor Hilbert of the Lutherkirche in Leipzig, in theology a disciple of Kähler-Halle, has already published a second edition of his popular and successful lectures on apologetic subjects given in Leipzig. The general title of the book is *Christentum und Wissenschaft*. The Christian's belief in God is discussed in the light of modern cosmology, of modern biology, and of modern psychology. Then follow three chapters on the person of Jesus Christ, His work, and His resurrection. The evangelical position is conserved throughout. The apologetic testimony of experts especially from among the representatives of the natural sciences is adduced. This work has added stimulus to apologetic efforts and has given the signal for a popular presentation of apologetic subjects to wider circles.

A third book evincing scholarly productivity along apologetic

lines is from the prolific pen of that able and energetic representative of Seeberg's theology, Karl Beth of Vienna. His work, *Der Entwicklungsgedanke und das Christentum* may be taken as a comprehensive answer to the popular interrogation, "Evolution or Christianity?" It is an exhaustive and convincing effort to show the possibility of reconciling this fundamental characteristic of modern thought with the cardinal features of the Christian religion. The proposition defended is that the idea of evolution is not only perfectly reconcilable with the Christian faith, but that the Christian actually gains from viewing the world, humanity, the divine activity and human life from the standpoint of evolution. The aim is to disprove the frequent assertion of enmity between Christianity and evolution and to prove a certain amount of congenial affinity between them. The individual loci of theology are taken up and examined with a view to determining what effect the evolutionistic idea produces upon them. By way of introduction the author gives a careful definition of evolution and an historical sketch of the influence of the idea in theology. The anti-telological, Darwinistic, mechanical conception of evolution is firmly rejected as worn out in natural science and utterly useless for theology. But concerning the teleological interpretation and application of the idea the conclusion is that "religion has good historical grounds for employing the idea in its service."

The Christian view of the world is found to be perfectly compatible with the application of evolutionism to inorganic nature and even to matter, for the conclusion is reached that the doctrine of the divine immanence as discovered to man through the authority of Jesus Christ excludes the conception of a world finished from the start, complete in itself, and dualistically opposed to God, and actually demands the conception of the world as constantly advancing towards a goal through the providence and continuous creation of God. The idea of evolution applied also to the world of living organisms harmonizes with the Christian view of the world. For it makes it possible to understand the entire enormous course of growth and development in the world of nature even to the growth of humanity itself as the process by means of which a rational and ethical creation was formed, the purpose being that this new and last creation might

henceforth mount to a new stage of development in spiritual being peculiar to itself. And as for the bearing of this upon the Christian view of the dignity of man, it is shown at some length that man is differentiated from the animal world by his spiritual life and therefore marks a leap in the evolutionary process. But teleological evolution reckons with the possibility of such leaps (mutation of species by halmatogenesis) and is therefore in no way contradictory to the Christian doctrine of the worth of man. All the rest of creation is preliminary to man. "The thought that the human race was evolved from a preceding stage in the world of nature, the thought that God's plan had so arranged the world that the human race should come into existence by the way of evolution, *i. e.*, the thorough-going idea of the descent of man, is the postulate of the Christian's conception and valuation of the world and of man."

The primitive state of man was not one of positive ethico-religious perfection but of capacity for the same. The origin of man as a rational being with spiritual capability for positive righteousness is the result of salient evolution. There was a first revelation, a special act of God. But the history of religion and of revelation itself shows that here also there has been a development. Sin is a recession, an abandonment of the line of evolution as set by God. Thus the doctrine of original sin receives new footing. Physical death is not as such the consequence of sin, rather is it the divinely established regulator of the stream of evolution making room for new beings and new powers which crowned with the laurels won by their predecessors shall press on to the achievement of still greater and more glorious victories. With Jesus Christ, whatever the preparation for His coming, there entered the world by virtue of the constant creative agency of God and through salient evolution a new creature at once supreme and complete. But this does not preclude an ontogenetic evolution in His person, a gradual growth into the full realization of His theanthropic calling. In like manner the same line of thought is applied to nearly every detail of the Christian system, though not always with the same degree of success.

This work of Beth's is stimulating and suggestive and while it can not be regarded as the final word on these subjects it will

not fail to beget large incentive to detailed investigation along these lines. It will not be without high significance for future apologetics.

Much attention has been given recently to the relation between the Christianity of Paul and that of Christ. The "Lives of Jesus" have ceased with Wrede's and the discussion has turned upon Paul. Who is the founder of Christianity as we have it to-day? This has been the question for some years. The question was made large and acute through the controversy precipitated by Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums*. (Incidentally be it remarked that Harnack's book [*vide* LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, vol. xxxi, pp. 121sqq.; vol. xxxii, pp. 142 sqq. and 575 sqq.] has just appeared in a new edition with seven pages of notes bringing "a few corrections" and marking a number of peripheral concessions but insisting upon his old positions and "no essential reconstruction.") The work has now been translated into twelve other languages and the number of sold copies must approach 100,000.) In his lectures last winter Harnack reasserted his dictum that "Not Christ himself, but the Father alone belongs in the Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it." The conclusion of course is that the Christology and Soteriology of the early Church and of modern orthodoxy is an iniquitous supersession of the pure Gospel of Jesus and the charge is made that Paul is the one who is responsible for this baneful replacement. Hence the questions as to the exact meaning of Paul and of Jesus and the difference between their theologies. Recent literature on the subject bulks large. Most worthy of mention are: *Feine, Jesus Christ and Paul*, 1902; *Wrede, Paul*, 1904; *Kaftan, Jesus and Paul* 1906; *Kölbding, The Spiritual Influence of Jesus' Person on Paul*, 1906; *Jülicher, Paul and Jesus*, 1907; *Arnold Meyer, Who Founded Christianity, Jesus or Paul?* 1907; *Wustmann, Jesus and Paul*, 1907; *Hauck, Jesus and Paul*, 1908; *Johannes Weiss, Paul and Jesus*, 1909; *Wustmann, A Contradiction between Paul's Gospel and Jesus' Proclamation?* 1909.

The most recent utterance on the subject is a series of articles in current numbers of the *Christliche Welt*. These articles are especially significant in their position on the subject in view of their source. They are from the pen of Dr. Hans Windisch,

a vigorous young private docent at Leipzig, presumably very liberal. He gives a brief review of present thought on the subject and maintains that the tendency at present is to bridge the chasm between Christ and Paul.

Summarizing the results of the debate he points out undeniable differences between the two, in the emphasis placed upon the saving facts, in the significance attached to the Person of Jesus, in their manner of dealing with men, in their grounds for opposition to the current Judaism, and in their eschatology. The difference is not so much a change of materials as a transition, a remodeling of the same structure. How is this reconstruction to be accounted for? Paul is not its author. It was essentially complete before Paul's conversion. It can be traced to the Church before Paul and is grounded in certain sayings of Jesus himself. The course of history brought about the transition, and that of necessity. The lapse of time and the course of events as well as the difference in temperament account for the seeming change. But in no case is Paul the founder of present-day Christianity. Not even the experiences of the primitive disciples first produced this religion. A mere glance at the person of the historical Jesus shows that in Him alone is given the decisive impulse to the formation of a new religious community. The self-consciousness of Jesus differs immensely from that of Paul. It is vastly superior to that of mere prophets and apostles. Scientific thinking demands for the explanation of the genesis and continuation of Christianity not merely the speculation of one or more theologians but the appearance and work of a personal Beginner.

And Paul's part in the development of this religion lies not in the fact that he was the first to have these experiences, nor yet the first to think out the primitive Christian theology, but the first to think through the new situation and the content of the new Gospel, developing it into a systematic series of correlative ideas. He founded systematic theology in that he wrought out the great antitheses, guilt and atonement, death and life, sin and grace, flesh and spirit. His keen theological insight and his rich personal experience are the two factors which, grounded upon his deeply pious life, fitted him to clothe Christ's Gospel in the garb of a theological system. In

this system the fundamental ideas of Jesus' Gospel recur though in very different order and orientation. The idea of the kingdom of God is found in Paul. He is filled with the same zeal for the forgiveness of sins that Jesus was. The highest ethical values are identical in both cases, pureness of heart, forgiveness of sins, the will to do good, strictness of morals, and self-denial. Above all, the atoning significance if Jesus' death is common to both. For it can no longer be denied that Jesus himself gave expression, belated but actual, to this thought which afterwards became so fundamental to Paul. In short, Jesus through word and deed is the founder of Christianity; the transition to systematic form was begun by the primitive disciples and completed by Paul.

The significance of this utterance on the part of Windisch is not small. It denotes a decided shift towards the right. Perhaps the course of time will bring about the complete rehabilitation of Paul. This is what the Positives have been contending for. In a word, Christ in His messianic vocation not only claims royal dominion but also manifests the consciousness of a close inner fellowship with God transcending the bounds of mere derived religion. He claims to be a ransom (*λιτρόν*) He forgives sin, He calls Himself the salvation of the weary and heavy-laden, the judge of the living and the dead. If this be the content of His messianic consciousness—oneness with God—it really includes the demand that men should believe in Him and not merely with Him. Jesus is the object of His Gospel and not merely its revealing subject. And Paul's formula: Jesus is the Lord (*κύριος*) and his predicate "God" (*θεός*) is in perfect accord with the teaching of Jesus Himself and with the confession of the primitive Church: I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord.

This is the view to which even liberal thought seems to be hurrying: the messianic consciousness of Jesus produced in a straight line leads to the worshipping of Jesus. Between the Gospel proclaimed by Jesus and the system developed in Paul, there is a distinction but not a difference. For the root of Paul's theology is found in Christ's own teaching. Now blossoms and fruit are a matter of evolutionary unfolding, but they are one in essence with the root. The essence of Christianity is

the same in Paul as it is in Jesus. Paul's interpretation and formulation marks but a necessary step in the transmission and conservation of the essence.

These few notices will perhaps indicate the lines of thought occupying the attention of systematic and New Testament theologians. Noteworthy appearances in systematic theology from the liberal camp, as well as works in Old Testament, historical theology, and practical theology, must be reserved for later reports.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE XI.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA. 25 E. 22ND ST., NEW YORK.

The Sociology of the Bible. By Ferdinand S. Schenck, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, at New Brunswick, N. J. Pp. 428. Price \$1.50 net.

When we remember that Sociology is one of the newest of the sciences, it is remarkable how deep a hold it has taken on the popular mind, and how large a place it has claimed for itself in education and literature.

In the first chapter of this book, the author says, "Theology was old, Astronomy was gray when Sociology was born. In 1883 there was not a chair of Sociology in any University or College in the world. In 1883 the first book on Dynamic Sociology was published. Many men now living are older than the science of Sociology."

Our own Dr. Stuckenbergh was one of the pioneers in this subject, especially as studied from the Christian standpoint. His book on "Christian Sociology" was published in 1880, and was without doubt the first of its kind. In the introduction of this volume he bears this testimony, "The author has frequently and deeply felt the need of a science giving an explanation of the nature, the relation, and the duties of Christian Society. Books on this subject are greatly needed by the theologian, the preacher and the intelligent Christian layman. But a searching investigation into theological literature, and inquiry among men familiar with this literature, have convinced him that no such book exists. * * In all his search, the author has never found the term "Christian Sociology" and it has, probably, never before been used in theology."

This was written only thirty years ago, or less. Now there are scores of books, yes, literally hundreds of them, dealing with the general subject of Sociology, and many of them have a distinctly Christian flavor, or treat the subject from a definitely Christian standpoint, and there is not a university or college, and hardly a theological seminary, of any standing, which does not recognize this subject in its course of study.

Among the many books on the general subject of Christian

Sociology, the author of this volume claims for it the distinction that, so far as his knowledge goes, "This is the first book on Biblical Sociology. Books on Christian Sociology are generally confined to the teachings of Christ, or to a description of the Christian Society of to-day. In this book I try to gather the most important facts and principles of the society of the whole Bible from Genesis to Revelation, to classify them in a sociological way, and to consider what light they throw upon some of the social problems of to-day."

We are further informed, in the preface, that the book is based on lectures delivered by the author to the students of the seminary in which he is a professor. He says, "The lectures on Sociology I have been giving the students of our Theological Seminary for the past six years have been designed to make them leaders of the Church in a conscious and intelligent effort to better society. I have tried to show them how the knowledge of the laws of God as we discover them both in the social life of mankind generally, and especially in the social life described in the Bible, may be applied in establishing the Kingdom of God, the highest ideal of society in each community, and in the whole earth. This book contains the substance of these lectures wrought into the form of popular reading."

In this effort to popularize the treatment, it has not ceased to be scholarly and thorough, neither is the book one for easy reading. It will require, as it well deserves and will rightly repay, the most careful reading and study.

The discussion is divided into four parts:

Part I deals with "Related Subjects," such as Socialism, Evolution, The Higher Criticism, &c.

Part II discusses "The General Society of the Bible," its Origin, its Primitive Character, its Primary Classes, and the Dispersion of the Race.

Part III, which is the longest, has for its general subject, "The Kingdom of God, or the Particular Society of the Bible." Some of the special chapter headings in this part are, The Modern Sociological Point of View, Heredity, The Institution of the Family, Environment, The Land Laws of the Hebrews, The Accumulation and the Distribution of Wealth, Social Pathology, The Ideal of Social Health, &c.

Part IV, on "The Kingdom of God in the World," is perhaps the most important of all. It has five chapters on the following subjects, Chapter 21 on "Christianity in the Advance of Civilization from Ancient Rome;" Chapter 22 on "Christianity in Advance of Civilization from our own Barbarian Ancestors;" Chapter 23 on "Christianity a Social Force in Foreign Missions;" Chapter 24 on "The Further Advance of Christian Civi-

lization;" Chapter 25 on "The Christian, the Church and the Universal Kingdom of God."

A specially full index adds much to the value of the volume for collateral reading. It is unfortunate that so excellent a book should have suffered so much from careless proof-reading. Many of the mistakes are only typographical and are easily corrected, but in some cases there has evidently been a substitution of the wrong word entirely. One of the most glaring cases of this is found on page 21 where Matthew Arnold's well known definition of religion is quoted as "Religion is morality touched with evolution."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS. CHICAGO.

Social Duties from the Christian Point of View. A Text-book for the Study of Social Problems. By Charles Richmond Henderson. Pp. 332.

This volume belongs to the "Advanced and Supplementary Series" of "Constructive Biblical Studies," being published by the University of Chicago Press. This series is intended for the use of Bible Classes, or Teachers' Training Classes, or any other classes of earnest men and women engaged in the serious study of religious and social questions. It includes such subjects as "The Life of Christ," "The Priestly Element in the Old Testament," "Christianity and its Bible," "Great Men of the Christian Church," &c.

Professor Henderson, the author of this volume on "Social Duties from the Christian Point of View," has already achieved distinction as a student of and writer on social questions, having published some half dozen volumes dealing with their various phases.

The book is intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. It is meant to be a guide to teachers and students rather than a book simply for reading. It is really much of the character of a very full "syllabus" such as a teacher might put into the hands of his students in the university or theological seminary.

There are sixteen chapters dealing with such topics as "Social Duties Relating to the Family," "Social Duties Relating to Neglected Children," "Social Duty to Workingmen," "Social Duties in Rural Communities," five chapters on various phases of "Urban Life," &c., &c.

The following extract from the preface is fairly well descriptive of the treatment given these and the other topics, "The treatment found in this text-book is brief, even fragmentary; it is only a push and a hint. Perhaps it is all the better that the

paragraphs contain so little matter; their chief purpose is to start independent thinking. It is not predigested mental food, offering a false hope of easy and cheap mastery of vast and vital problems; it is a call to intellectual labor; it is a summons to patriotic and religious toil."

As a help to this kind of serious study, and making a most valuable part of the book, the author appends to each chapter, and often even to the paragraphs on special subjects, quite full "References to Literature" for collateral reading, and also lists of "Topics for Study and Discussion."

No class of earnest minded men and women could possibly do the work called for in this book without becoming deeply interested, nor without great profit both to themselves and to the community in which they live.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK.

The Starry Universe the Christian's Future Empire. By Horace C. Stanton, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Cloth... Pp. 25, 362... Price \$1.50 net.

There is much in this enthusiastically written book that is true and beautiful, more that is merely fanciful and speculative. No Christian will dispute the beauty of heaven, the degrees of glory, recognition and the immortality of love. But when the flight of the glorified through the universe from earth to moon, and planet and star is dogmatically asserted, we confess that neither our imagination nor our judgment is quite equal to the author's flight. The basis of the argument lies in man's love for beauty, his thirst for knowledge, and his desire to know God's creation that we may know him better. The possibility of the flight is argued from the nature of the resurrection body, which like that of Christ, is immensely superior to the earthly body, unaffected by adverse circumstances and endowed with vast possibilities. These facts, added to an extremely literal interpretation of Bible passages, convince the author, if not the reader, of the truth of his theory.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

That Man Donalcitis. A Story of the Coal Regions. By Margaret R. Seebach, The John Rung Prize Series. Cloth. Pp. 451. Price \$1.25.

This is a story of more than ordinary merit. Donaleitis is a noble character, who overcomes the hindrances of ignorance, of a foreign tongue, of poverty and of Romish superstitions. Of

course, he is also a true lover and fond father. The scenes of a coal mining town are depicted in their true colors. The horrors of a long strike are described, and the causes which led to it faithfully set forth. Social, educational, ethical and religious problems are incidentally discussed without preaching. A vein of humor enlivens the volume. Those who know Mrs. Seebach's writings need not be told that the work possesses high literary merit. We heartily commend Donaleitis to all our readers. The boys and the girls will be as much interested in it as their more thoughtful parents.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Anniversary Addresses, 1869-1909. Addresses Delivered at the Fortieth Anniversary of the Board of Home Missions, Foreign Missions, and Church Extension of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, at Harrisburg, Pa., April 27-28, 1909. Cloth. Pp. 385. Price \$1.00.

The *Anniversary Addresses*, twenty-eight in number, on the various phases of the work of the Boards of Home Missions, of Foreign Missions, and of Church Extension, though necessarily brief, are of a high order of merit both as to matter and style. They are packed with a vast array of facts, which the pastor and the people ought to know and which are here made accessible. They sparkle with enthusiasm. The broadcast circulation of this volume would increase the knowledge of our people, deepen their interest in the evangelization of the world, and multiply their offerings for the extension of the Kingdom.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN PUBLISHING HOUSE. DECORAH, IOWA.

Our Homes and Our Children. Lectures by O. Klynken. Translated from the Norwegian by Peer Stromme. Pp. 232. Price 75 cents.

From the Preface we learn that "these lectures were delivered in 1904, before the teachers and students of the school 'Fredly' in Strinden, Norway, a school belonging to the Trondhjem circuit of the Home Mission Society."

There are ten lectures, four on "Our Homes," and six on "Our Children." They are written in a clear, simple and direct style, and are full of homely common sense and good advice.

The titles of a few of the lectures indicate the scope of the discussion, "How do We Secure a Happy Home?" "Family Sorrows;" "How do We Train Our Children in Obedience?" "How do We Train Our Children in Moral Purity?"

No one can read this little book without profit, but it will be especially helpful to young people, and to parents and teachers.

J. A. CLUTZ

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Unterscheidungslehren der hauptsächlichen sich Lutherisch nennenden Synoden, so wie der nämhaftesten Sektenkirchen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika, von J. J. Grosse, ev. luth. Pastor in Addison, Ill. Viente Auflag. Cloth. Pp. v., 176. Price 40 cents.

This little volume, which treats of the *Distinctive Doctrines* held by the principal Lutheran Synods, and also of those held by *sects*, is now in its fourth edition. This indicates that it is being industriously circulated among German people. The conclusion of the book is that the Missouri Synod alone possesses the true faith! All other Synods are thoroughly steeped in error! The General Synod, for instance, is not truly Lutheran either in doctrine or practice. For proof of this he quotes from Dr. Seiss' *Javelin* published forty years ago, from the report of a committee made in 1845, and from various other ancient transactions. He misunderstands or wilfully perverts the subscription of the General Synod to the Augsburg Confession. Should the present edition ever unfortunately be exhausted, we would counsel Pastor Grosse to consult the minutes of the General Synod of the year 1909, before he issues a fifth edition.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

An Epoch in the Scriptural Life. By Charles Newman Curtis. Cloth. Pp. viii., 328. Price \$1.25.

This volume essays a restatement of Wesley's doctrine of "entire sanctification" or "Christian perfection." This is deemed desirable because of a misunderstanding of these matters, and also because of the advancement in knowledge and its methods since Wesley's day.

The founder of Methodism has sometimes been misinterpreted by his followers and his foes. His idea of "perfection" is not that one may attain an absolutely sinless state or that he may become infallible any more than omniscient, but that he may attain a state in which he is no longer conscious of sinning.

Our author argues that it is entirely rational, biblical and within the reach of every Christian to attain "full salvation." By this he means "a heart full of love, that will stay full." (p. 206). "With the supreme choice right, the divine love filling the whole

soul to its conscious limits and the permanence of this state mark largely the entireness of sanctification." "The fully saved man feels only love to all; he is 'established,' made complete in Christ, abiding in him without interruption daily."

The evidence of being in a state of "full salvation" is largely a matter of consciousness. Self-examination will reveal to a man his attitude on moral questions. If the result be that he find himself free from all sorts of evil thoughts and dispositions and full of love toward God and man, he is entitled to believe that he is now in that happy state of "full salvation," "God has done the work, and done it instantaneously" (p. 213).

The foregoing quotations show the gist of the book. While we believe that sanctification is necessarily progressive rather than instantaneous, we have no doubt that the effort of a sanctified will may so greatly accelerate the process that the earnest Christian may realize that he has been enabled at a specific time to overcome this or that unholv tendency. The reading of the book will be stimulating if not altogether convincing.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Socialized Church. Edited by Worth M. Tippy, D.D., Secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Service. Pp. 288. Price \$1.00 net.

This rich and suggestive volume is made up of eleven papers read before the "First National Conference of the Social Workers of Methodism," held in St. Louis in 1908. Many of the writers are experts in the subjects discussed and are therefore qualified to speak with authority. All of them are men and women of recognized ability whose papers deserve careful and thoughtful reading.

The range of subjects discussed is wide including such topics as, "The Church and the Social Need;" "The Church and Organized Charity;" "What Workingmen Might Reasonably Expect from the Church;" "The Deaconess as the Pastor's Social Assistant;" "The Pulpit as a Social Force;" "The Socialized Church," &c., &c.

We commend this book to the reading of all who are interested in the relation of the Church to the social questions of the day, and even more to those who are not interested but ought to be. It would be specially helpful to our younger ministers.

J. A. CLUTZ.

Prophecy and the Prophets in Their Historical Relations. By Frederick Carl Eiselen, Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. Cloth. Pp. 331. Price \$1.50 net.

This book is intended to be an aid toward a better apprecia-

tion of the prophetic books and the prophetic teaching. It is not intended to displace the study of the biblical books themselves, but rather to stimulate such study by furnishing an introduction to these books. It gives an historical background which is not always apparent to the average student. Thus each of the prophets is made to stand out in his proper environment. His message, therefore, becomes more vivid and comprehensible.

The author has done his work well. The style is simple and didactic. While this book is intended primarily for adult Bible classes in Sunday Schools or young people's organizations, it is really well adapted for use in advanced schools, and even by ministers.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Earliest Cosmologies. By Fairfield Warren, S. T. D., LL.D., Cloth. Price \$1.50 net.

Dr. Warren has undertaken the outline of a most difficult course for the student of cosmology. He himself is an enthusiast in this region of thought. He has the courage of his convictions. He believes that his data for his theories are sufficient, that there is a common "world-view" concept. The present work is an attempt to gather up his study on the subject of comparative cosmology. He believes the Babylonian cosmological system will interpret all others.

The explanations of the various concepts of the world as set forth by such savants as Whitehouse and Schiaparelli, whose ideas are generally followed as to the Hebrew world-concept, has led to a rejection of their views. In short the whole conception of a disc-like universe he holds impossible and contends strenuously for a sphere-like conception. He contends that this world's cosmological norm-view is fully justified by Babylonian research, and he fearlessly attacks Maspero's views in which the whole universe is imagined to be a large box "nearly rectangular, whose greatest diameter was from south to north, and its least from east to west." He contends that the task of combining many divergent views is very simple and to him the diagram of "a two seven-staged pyramids" explains all. His attempt is to show how Biblical, Rabinical, Homeric, Puranic, Egyptian and Indo-Iranian concepts of the universe are explainable by reference to a correct comprehension of the Babylonian. His conclusion arrived at after carrying the reader through nine chapters with masterly genius, is "that we have seen no little evidence that in countries widely separated the earliest traceable teachers held and taught what was essentially one and the same world-concept. His tenth chapter is taken up with unsolved problems for future students and concludes with an earnest plea for the "real

cradle land of the whole human race," as lying "within the Arctic circle"—a region equidistant from India, Babylonia and Egypt. The concept involved in the Zodiac which he regards "the most precious, if not the oldest scientific heirlooms of the human race," he thinks gets its explanation from, and explains, the axle-pillar idea, as can be done in no other way, by locating the cradle of the race and its early years within the Arctic Circle, where unrivalled opportunities are afforded for studying astronomical questions.

In regard to the book and its teaching it may be said that while one is constrained to admire the acumen of the writer and the fertility of his imagination, one is disposed to ask himself "cui bono?" He may explode the "disc" theory of the universe attributed to the ancients and make out a good case for the view that they one and all held and taught, that their conception of the earth was spheroidal, and yet how can much that he posits be verified? He himself admits the great difficulty of the field of investigation. Writing of the mythology on which he must depend, he says, "the interpretation of myths is . . . about the most difficult and baffling of all the duties." It is, however, marvellous how he has ransacked Sanscrit authority to illumine his pages and to show how early Sanscrit and Iranian writers in many ways helped him to his conclusions. He is generally correct in his relative age estimates, but on page 99 he attempts to use Puranic teaching to substantiate Buddhistic world-view. The Puranas did not precede, but followed Buddhistic conception and were intended to displace them in Hinduism. One cannot but feel that Dr. Warren is in the last analysis trying to support his views of the cradle of the human race. Fascinating though the subject is, it is too removed from the sphere of "practical politics" to claim the serious attention of the student-world.

L. B. WOLF.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

The Bible for Home and School: Genesis. By Hinckley G. Mitchell, Ph.D., D.D. Cloth. Pp. 379. 5 x 6 1-2. Price 90 cents net.

The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. By Benjamin W. Bacon, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale University. Cloth. Pp. 135. Price 50 cents net.

Dr. Mitchell fully accepts the theory that Genesis is a compilation made by various redactors from three sources—the Judean or Johvistic document, the Ephraimite or Elohistic, and the

Priestly. The first of these is supposed to have been written not earlier than 878 B. C., and the last not earlier than 586 B. C. This, of course, entirely eliminates the authorship of Moses. This theory imputes great skill to the various redactors in joining narratives so cunningly as to deceive the vast majority of Bible readers. It also credits the critics with even greater skill in resolving the narrative into its original constituents.

The general attitude and style of the author may be seen from a few quotations. "This is the first account of creation. It is not, as has sometimes been claimed, a poem, but a sober attempt to explain the origin of the visible world, and, when one considers its antiquity, a very successful one. There is no other so early that can be compared with it. Indeed, it teaches the unity of nature and a gradual development of the world as clearly as modern science. The ideas of God and man, also which it suggests are lofty and inspiring, and calculated to stimulate piety and morality. It must, however, have become plain to any one who has followed the preceding discussion that this ancient cosmogony can not be regarded as a history of the process by which the world was created. For such knowledge, so far as it has ever been revealed, one must consult the records of modern science" (Page 38).

The work is scholarly and devout and will be helpful to the student possessed of discrimination.

Dr. Bacon in his Commentary on Galatians shows his critical skill and exegetical knowledge. We cannot agree with him in his representation of Luke in his record of Paul in Acts. Dr. Bacon would make it appear that Luke has misunderstood, if not misrepresented, Paul, and that Galatians and Acts do not agree as to Paul's attitude on Judaism. We fail to be convinced, and have no difficulty in reconciling Luke's straightforward narrative with Paul's revelation of himself in his epistles. Nor can we accept the theory of the atonement as taught by Dr. Bacon, who declares that "Paul seems to take special pains to avoid both the phraseology and the implications of the substitutionary theory, conceiving the suffering of Jesus in a more moral sense." "Paul always avoids the cruder form of the doctrine which may be called the substitutionary." In this form Jesus is said to have died 'in our stead' (*anti*) as against the Pauline 'for us' (*peri*) or 'for our advantage' (*hyper*). Pp. 48, 49.

But it is true, as Thayer says, that *anti* and *hyper* are used interchangeably, e. g., by Irenaeus, and thus his death "in our stead" is "for our advantage." No theory of the atonement has any substantial ground in the Pauline epistles which fails to recognize that somehow Jesus took our place in reconciling the

Father to us. We must not forget that Jesus was made to be sin for us (2 Cor. 5:21). He took our place and bore the penalty and the burden of our sin for us. He had identified himself with humanity, but not with its guilt. Being personally without sin and guilt, he could make atonement for others.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Temple. By Lyman Abbott. Cloth. Illuminated cover.

Pp. 171. Price \$1.25 net.

'The Temple is not that of Solomon at Jerusalem, but the human body, which as the Scriptures declare, is the sanctuary of the Holy Spirit. The object of *The Temple* is not to expound the philosophies of either the psychologist or the physiologist. It is to describe human experience: as it is and as it ought to be; to interpret the laws both of the body and of the spirit. It is to describe human nature.'

This is a beautiful book in every way,—in binding, printing and in contents. It is a series of practical addresses on man as he is or ought to be. It deals with the senses, appetites, and nobler powers of the soul. There are eleven chapters, each suggestive of good things. Young preachers will find material and inspiration here for Sunday evening sermons of a popular character.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

A Certain Rich Man. By William Allen White, Author of "Stratagems and Spoils," etc. Cloth. Pp. 434. Price \$1.50.

This is a powerful story, in which historic interest, keen analysis of character, exposure of sordidness and the holding up of high ideals, blend. The author has woven his material so skillfully that one feels that he is reading more than fiction. So important does Dr. Washington Gladden consider Mr. White's novel that he recently made it the theme of a sermon. John Barclay, the chief character of the story, is the son of a widow whose husband, a minister, was slain as a martyr to the cause of abolition. The widow is a noble soul, who brings up her son at great sacrifice. He, however, fails to catch his mother's spirit. He is enterprising, grows rich through unscrupulous schemes, in which he spares not the happiness, honor or life of friend or foe. He barely escapes jail, is finally brought by his mother to recognize the unrighteousness and enormity of his deeds, repents, makes restitution and in a measure regains the happiness which he had forfeited.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine. By Henry Churchill King, President of Oberlin College. Pp. 159. Price \$1.25 net.

This volume is the resultant of a course of thoughtful lectures delivered before a Haverford College audience. The theme, the audience and the speaker so happily united, that the message is one that rings and will be remembered.

Friendship is, indeed, a sacred theme. Haverford is the name of a celebrated Friends' college. The author is an accomplished and analytic writer, discussing his subject with rare and remarkable ability. He reminds us that the greatest questions are never new. Friendship is treated in this splendid volume as no subordinate or side issue—but as he declares in the preface, "the problem of the whole life." The problem of friendship is the problem of life itself.

No discriminating reader can fail to acknowledge the refreshing and stimulating power of a thinker and teacher whose delineation is as charming as his discovery is profound. The world needs to be enlightened with such a message. Too true is the assertion that genuine and sincere friendship can point to but few examples. The divine conception is needed to determine and emphasize the friendship that can endure adversity. This our author has not hidden from view.

While the volume is brief, no essential element has been overlooked. It stands forth in attractive presentation, winning close attention and enriching the reader as he follows the gifted pen's portrayal. Following an illuminating introduction the book is arranged in two parts: Establishing the Friendship and Deepening the Friendship. How fair the illustrations of such friendship as David and Jonathan, Luther and Melanchthon! These only give force to the author's choice sentence: "Human friendship can least of all spare the hopes of religion. The human cries out irresistibly for the support of the divine." Many gems shine and sparkle throughout the pages of the book. Their light and riches need a more general welcome in our busy world.

CHAS. REINEWALD.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

Der Zionsbote, Christlicher Volkskalender auf das Jahr unseres Heilandes, 1910.

Our enterprising German Literary Board has issued its handsome and useful Almanac for the thirteenth year. It contains the usual information pertaining to the calendar besides much that is interesting and edifying.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

The Christian Doctrine of God. By William N. Clarke, D.D.
Crown 8vo. Pp. 477. Price \$2.50 net.

This volume belongs to the International Theological Library Series. From many quarters the cry has been heard that a re-statement of theology is absolutely necessary to meet the changes of modern thought. Such a theology, it has been claimed, must be independent of the historical creeds. As this volume is written from the standpoint of those who make such a demand, it must be of interest to every student of theology whether the author's conclusions be accepted or not.

One is impressed, in reading the book, with the fact that this theology makes no claim of anything like finality in its conclusions. The very definition that is given of the Christian Doctrine of God as "the conception of God which Christian faith and thought propose for the present time, in view of the Bible, and of the history, and of all sound knowledge and experience, interpreted in the light of Jesus Christ the Revealer," shows that the author expects this theology to be superseded by a theology of the future. He does not condemn the theology of the Nicene Fathers nor of the dogmatists, but regards their systems as the theology needed for their times but not suited to ours. One can not but contrast this with the ring of certainty that we find in Paul's theology in the Epistle to the Romans, for instance. After all these ages, can theology lay no claim to eternal verities?

The doctrine of God as here presented, departs from the traditional theology in practically denying that the Bible is decisive in matters of faith. The Old Testament differs only in degree from the sacred books of other countries. A chapter is devoted to the Trinity, and yet the standpoint of the book is that of Unitarianism. All men are capable of receiving God; Christ only received Him in His fulness. Therefore he is the Revealer of the Father. God's presence in man—this is the Holy Spirit. God, God in Christ, God in men—this is Father, Son and Spirit—the Trinity as it is here presented. One can not help but wonder why the old terminology is not discarded along with the old doctrine. No special creation of man is admitted. He is merely the product of an evolutionary process. In justice to the author let it be stated, however, that no one could insist more strongly on the fact that an immanent God touches and directs the process at every point. Again and again is sin admitted, but it is part of the upward process, the impulses of the former lower stage struggling with the higher spirit in man.

With sin God is in conflict, but no atonement is needed. With the sinner God is in conflict only till he turns.

These departures from the traditional theology are vital. Yet the author defends certain truths peculiar to Christian doctrine which differentiate his doctrine *in toto* from the teachings of other cults. That man is made in the image of God is so fundamental an assumption that it gives to this system of doctrine an anthropomorphic coloring in the presence of which the anthropomorphisms of even the early Old Testament are dim. Emphasis is laid on the moral attributes of God—goodness, love, holiness and wisdom—and not on the metaphysical ones. One can not but contrast this with the theology of philosophers which has dwelt altogether on the latter. Moral attributes must belong to personality and the defense of the personality of God impresses us as the strongest part of the book. The untenability of both agnosticism and pantheism could not be more strongly maintained. Running through the entire discussion is the assumption that our purest instincts and best knowledge do not deceive us but lead us to reality. One who has lived in the atmosphere of Hinduism with its doctrine of illusion which envelops the mind of everyone and leads us to assume as real what is false can not help but feel that this trust in God's truth and faithfulness, which this assumption implies, has a Christian source. The old arguments for the existence of the great and good God—and the author concludes instead of beginning his book with the evidences—are thought to have had their day. In discarding these and finding in the rational and the spiritual sure ground for such belief, the argument for theism is, we believe, strengthened rather than weakened. Belief in God is the concluding chapter of the book. This is belief in the goodness of God, "the normal assumption of rational minds that existence has been fairly and honestly given us as a blessing and not as a curse." This seems but a feeble definition of Christian belief but it is all that the doctrine of God herein presented warrants us in holding.

The author does not discuss the way of salvation. That was beyond the scope of his book. In spite of many excellent things in it, in spite even of the high regard for Christ as the Revealer of God, we can not but prefer St. Paul's doctrine of God, with its enthronement of Christ over all and its sure ground of salvation in Him. The old theology makes no more assumptions than the new. It does, what the new theology fails to do, deal fairly and honestly with the great facts concerning Christ. As a setting forth, however, of what the new theology is, and as a defense even if much that is vital to Christian theism, the volume under review deserves careful study.

JOHN ABERLY.

